

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have a motion to make.
Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am afraid, Mr. President, that the debate is just beginning.

Mr. KENYON. There are some amendments to be offered, I know; and if it is proposed to ask for a vote on this amendment to-night I shall be compelled to call for a quorum. It is about 6 o'clock, anyhow, and it seems to me we might as well take a recess now.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I had expected to finish this bill early to-day.

Mr. THOMAS. Why not hold a night session?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I would if I could get Senators to stay here, but it has been difficult to keep them here this long. They have been talking about leaving for an hour, and we can not get them to stay here. I should be very glad if we could get a vote on the bill. I do not think the discussion is going to change anybody's vote. Every Senator must know what he thinks about this amendment. I do not see what good talk does about it.

Mr. KENYON. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If we can get a vote that is all I want, and we could finish the bill to-night. The Senate has a right to do as it pleases about the matter. It is no disappointment to me. Whatever the Senate wants will suit me. The Members of the Senate can vote it in or vote it out, just as they see fit, but I should like to get a vote now.

Mr. KENYON. I think we have made tremendous progress on this bill to-day. I should be glad to see it passed.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. There has been real progress, but there have been very few disputed items in it.

Mr. KENYON. As far as I am concerned, I do not want to be a party to delaying the bill to-night, but I shall ask for the yeas and nays on this proposition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the request seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. I simply wish to inquire of the Senator from Virginia if it would not be possible to take a recess until 8 o'clock to-night? Then, by having a night session, we could surely dispose of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I should be glad to do that, but there are so many Senators protesting against it that I hardly feel justified in expecting them to attend a night session.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that I had an understanding that at 6 o'clock the Senate would take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning. I have told a number of Senators that that would be done, and they have gone. I really think, in justice to that statement made by me, that the Senate ought to take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

I will say to the Senator that I have not a word to say upon the question. I think we are ready to vote upon it, and if a recess is taken I do not think there will be any discussion upon it in the morning.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. All I am afraid of is that in the morning we will come back with a fresh start and we will have a dozen speeches and they will occupy the day.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I do not think so. I do not think there is any intention whatever of debating the matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Can we get unanimous consent to vote on the amendment at 11.30 to-morrow?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I suggest that the Senator try it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that we vote on this amendment not later than 11.30 to-morrow morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I will make no objection if the Senator will make it 12 o'clock.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Senator has just said he was through. Why does he want to carry it over for a longer time?

Mr. KENYON. No; I said to the Senator that I had an amendment to offer to the bill.

Mr. SHAFROTH. But this is only on this amendment.

Mr. KENYON. Oh, on this amendment. Yes, indeed; that is all right. I thought the Senator meant on the bill itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia requests unanimous consent to vote on this amendment not later than 11.30 o'clock to-morrow. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and that agreement is entered into.

RECESS.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, February 20, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 19, 1915.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, from whom are all things temporal and spiritual, increase our spiritual vision and our moral integrity, that we may meet all the duties and responsibilities of life with perfect faith and confidence in the overruling of Thy providence, assured that all things work together for good to them that love Thee and seek to do Thy will; for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I notice that the Journal states that the point of no quorum just before adjournment was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. The RECORD correctly shows that the point of order was made by Mr. MOORE. I ask to correct the Journal to conform to the fact.

The SPEAKER. The Journal will be corrected to conform to the fact.

The Journal as corrected was approved.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the pension appropriation bill which was passed yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the pension appropriation bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WORDS SPOKEN IN DEBATE.

The SPEAKER. When the House adjourned last night the pending question was the motion for the previous question on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] to strike from the RECORD certain words spoken in debate by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I withhold the demand for the previous question and yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, as I stated last night, I had no desire to reflect on the honor and integrity of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER]. I made clear the purpose of my remarks. I uttered the words "honorably and dishonorably." I have no desire to continue this debate; neither have I any desire nor feeling to add to or reiterate what I stated. I wish to eliminate the word "dishonorably"; but in order to do that and express my thought, the word "honorably" must also be eliminated, and I wish to add these words:

Deprived you, Mr. Speaker, of delegates when Democratic public sentiment was in your favor.

That will complete the sense of the paragraph, and I ask unanimous consent to amend the RECORD in that way.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] asks unanimous consent to amend the RECORD in the manner stated by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion to strike out the words.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 5259) to establish one or more United States Navy mail lines between the United States and South America and between the United States and the countries of Europe, asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. RANDELL, Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. NELSON, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. CRAWFORD as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 2642. An act authorizing the President to reinstate Joseph Elliot Austin as an ensign in the United States Navy.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 21201) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916. Pending that motion, I

would like to see if we can agree upon the time for general debate.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I have requests for about three hours. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOMEW] wishes to make a speech, which he characterizes as his "swan song," a sort of farewell address to the House, which will take one hour. I know we all wish to hear him, and I have requests from other gentlemen for about two hours more.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will allow me, I think the way is clear to get the appropriation bills out of the way now before the 4th of March, if we get down to business. But it seems to me that six hours' general debate on this appropriation bill at this time would be an unusual amount of time. I have no desire to interfere with gentlemen making speeches; but I think if that latitude of debate is allowed, we ought to have a gentleman's understanding that we are going to stay here to-night and pass this bill.

Mr. COOPER. I do not think there is any objection to that.

Mr. MANN. Is there, so far as anyone knows, much debate asked for on the Military Academy bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not see the chairman of that committee in the Hall at this moment.

Mr. MANN. I should think we ought to be able to pass the diplomatic bill and the Military Academy bill by to-morrow night, and that will leave us in very good shape.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The fortifications bill will probably bring a good deal of debate on the bill. The debate now proposed is not on the bill.

Mr. MANN. We have a week and a half after this week. The deficiency bill usually does not take very long.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I suggest that this debate be limited to four hours, and that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] control two hours and a half of it and that I control one hour and a half.

Mr. COOPER. Very well, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this bill be limited to four hours, two hours and a half to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] and one hour and a half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the general debate on this bill shall not exceed four hours, one hour and a half to be controlled by himself and two hours and a half by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PURCHASE OF SHIPS.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, before we go into the debate on the Diplomatic and Consular bill I ask unanimous consent to call up from the Speaker's table the shipping bill, which has come back from the Senate, and ask to agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (S. 5259) to establish one or more United States Navy mail lines between the United States and South America, and between the United States and the countries of Europe.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to take this bill from the Speaker's table and agree to the conference asked by the Senate. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will announce the conferees later.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The motion of Mr. FLOOD of Virginia was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, H. R. 21201, with Mr. LINTHICUM in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 21201) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday, in a discussion with the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], I made reference to the child-labor laws of the State of Georgia.

At that time I read from a statement which had been prepared by the National Child Labor Committee and submitted by their agents at the hearings before the Committee on Labor on the child-labor bill. Those hearings were held in the spring of 1914, and the statement of the child-labor conditions and child-labor laws in the various States was of course of that date. Relying upon its accuracy, I discussed the Georgia child-labor law from the standpoint as disclosed in that statement.

I have had my attention called this morning to the fact that on August 14, 1914, the Georgia Legislature passed a bill which was approved and became a law, to go into effect January 1, 1915, and that that law provides a liberal, just, fair, and equitable regulation of the labor of children in that State. I did not know about it yesterday; I had not kept up with the laws of the States so closely as to follow these laws passed within a few months, and I relied entirely upon the statement of the National Child Labor Committee.

I am going to ask unanimous consent, in order to do justice to the State of Georgia, to insert in the RECORD this law recently passed in that State, and I congratulate the State of Georgia on having fallen into line with the progressive States of the Union in protecting little children against the exploitation of employers. It adds another reason for the passage of a Federal child-labor law, because the more States that adopt proper laws, the more reason for the few remaining States to be compelled to accept such laws.

The law I read last night was the Georgia statute passed in 1908, which was repealed by the act of August 14, 1914, to which my attention has just been called. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing the law of August 14, 1914.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the law referred to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, merely for the purpose of obtaining information I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether his information, which now appears to have been inaccurate, was obtained from the National Child Labor Association?

Mr. PALMER. Yes; I made the statement that I read from the report of the agents of the National Child Labor Committee, and that that report was made at a meeting of the Committee on Labor last spring, before this Georgia statute was passed. The report then was accurate.

Mr. MOORE. I asked the question not to embarrass the gentleman but merely to show that sometimes we do get inaccurate information from those who agitate these matters.

Mr. PALMER. Yes; and we get inaccurate information from other sources.

Mr. ADAIR. But this was not inaccurate at the time it was made.

Mr. PALMER. No; but it has since been made obsolete.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. What was the date of the last statute enacted by the State of Georgia?

Mr. PALMER. August 14, 1914.

Mr. COOPER. I will say that I had the same pamphlet, and I did not know until this morning that Georgia had passed this statute.

Mr. PALMER. The statement I read was made before the Georgia act was passed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The statute is as follows:

CHILD LABOR, REGULATING EMPLOYMENT OF.

No. 426.

An act regulating the employment of children; to provide for the issuance of certificates with reference to age and educational qualifications of children; the revocation of such certificates by the commissioner of labor; designating prohibited hours of labor for such children; making it the duty of the commissioner of labor and authorized assistants to enforce this act; making it a misdemeanor to violate the provisions of this act; and to repeal the act approved August 1, 1906, entitled "An act to regulate the employment of children in factories and manufacturing establishments in this State, and to provide for the punishments of violations of the regulations prescribed, and for other purposes," and which said act repealed is codified in sections 3143, 3144, 3145, 3146, 3147, 3148, and 3149 of the Code of Georgia of 1910, and for other purposes.

SECTION 1. Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Georgia, That no child under the age of 14 years shall be employed by, or permitted to work in or about any mill, factory, laundry, manufacturing establishment, or place of amusement; except that children over 12 years of age who have widowed mothers dependent upon them for support, or orphan children over 12 years of age dependent upon their own labor for support, may work in factories and manufactories; except that the foregoing provisions of this section shall not be applicable in instances specified and provided for in section 8 of this act.

SEC. 2. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That no child under 14 years and 6 months shall be employed or be permitted to work in any of the establishments or occupations mentioned in section 1, unless the person, firm, or corporation employing such child has and keeps on file accessible to the officials charged with the enforcement of this act, a certificate from the superintendent of schools in the county or city in which such child resides, that such child is not less than 14 years of age, has attended school for not less than 12 weeks of the 12 months preceding the date of issuance of such certificate; except that the foregoing provisions of this section shall not be applicable in instances specified and provided for in section 8 of this act.

SEC. 3. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the certificate mentioned in the foregoing section shall state the full name, date and place of birth of the child, with the name and address of the parent, guardian, or person sustaining the parental relationship to such child, and that the child has appeared before the officer, and satisfactory evidence submitted that the child is of legal age. Blank forms of these certificates shall be furnished by the commissioner of labor to the superintendent of schools in the respective cities and counties. A duplicate copy of each certificate shall be filed with the commissioner of labor within four days from its issuance. The commissioner of labor may at any time revoke any certificate if, in his judgment, the certificate was improperly issued. He is authorized to investigate the true age of any child employed, hear evidence, and require the production of relevant books or documents. If the certificate is revoked, the then employer shall be notified, and said child shall not thereafter be employed or permitted to labor until a new certificate has been legally obtained; except that the foregoing provisions of this section shall not be applicable in instances specified and provided for in section 8 of this act.

SEC. 4. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That no child under 14 years and 6 months of age shall be permitted to work in or about any of the establishments mentioned in section 1, or section 2, of this act, between the hours of 7 p. m. and 6 a. m., according to the standard time of the community in which such establishment is located.

SEC. 5. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That it shall be the duty of the commissioner of labor and his authorized assistants to see that the provisions of this act are enforced.

SEC. 6. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That any person, agent, or representative of any firm or corporation violating any of the provisions of this act; or any parent, guardian, or other person standing in parental relationship to any child, who shall hire or place for employment or labor, any child under the age limits in any of the establishments or occupations mentioned in section 1 of this act, or any superintendent of county or city schools who shall issue a certificate knowing that its issuance was illegal; or any person who shall knowingly furnish any untrue evidence with reference to the date or place of birth of said child, or the age of said child or its educational qualifications, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be punished accordingly.

SEC. 7. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the act approved August 1, 1906, and entitled "An act to regulate the employment of children in factories and manufacturing establishments in this State and to provide for the punishment of violations of the regulations prescribed, and for other purposes," and codified in sections 3143 to 3149, inclusive, of the Code of Georgia of 1910, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 8. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That it shall be lawful for a child 12 years of age or more to work in and for a mill, factory, laundry, manufacturing establishment or place of amusement if such child has dependent upon his labor a widowed mother or if such child is an orphan dependent upon his own labor. Whenever such child desires to work in any of such places as is specified above the fact that such child's labor is necessary to support a widowed mother or to support such orphan child must be found to be true after an investigation by a commission composed of the county school superintendent and the ordinary of the county where the work is to be done, and the head of the school in the school district where the said child lives. After an investigation by said commission, if it, or a majority of its members, find that the facts exist to authorize such child to work in or for any of the establishments mentioned in section 1 of this act, because of the existence of either of the conditions herebefore set out, such commission shall issue a certificate to that effect which shall be kept of file in the office of the establishment where said child is at work. Such commission shall make an investigation and issue a new certificate at least once each six months, and may prescribe as a condition precedent to issuance of such certificate school attendance for such length of time and at such time as in its discretion seems wise. No such certificate more than six months old shall authorize the employment of any child under 14½ years of age in or for any of the places specified in section 1 of this act.

SEC. 9. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act be, and they are hereby, repealed.

SEC. 10. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the provisions of this act shall be in force on and after January 1, 1915.

Approved August 14, 1914.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill carries a total of \$4,454,370.01. This is an increase over the present law of \$144,513, and is \$130,312 less than the estimate sent in by the executive department to Congress.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has labored earnestly to cut down appropriations in this bill to the least possible amount necessary to the proper conduct of our foreign service. I believe we have done it. We have decreased the following among other items:

Salaries of interpreters to embassies and legations, \$6,000.
International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, \$7,500.

Arbitration of pecuniary claims, \$40,870.

Waterways Treaty International Joint Commission, \$10,000.

I believe that all of these decreases are justified by evidence submitted to the Foreign Affairs Committee. Of course there are some items in the bill of last year that are not carried in this bill. Then we have increased certain items. We have in-

creased the salaries of secretaries in the Diplomatic Service \$31,500. That was due to the law which recently went into effect, known as the reorganization of the Diplomatic and Consular Service. That law necessitated an increase of \$31,500 for secretaries to embassies and legations.

Then there is an increase in contingent expenses and foreign missions, \$10,500, due to the fact that Argentina and Chile have been raised from legations to embassies.

We have increased the allowance for clerk hire in the United States consulates \$117,800. That increase was deemed wise. There are several reasons why this increase should be granted. One of the principal weaknesses of the Consular Service for several years has been the inadequate number of competent clerks employed. The work of the Consular Service has vastly increased, and to a great extent the increase has been of a character which requires a higher grade of clerical assistance than has heretofore been necessary. Moreover, an earnest attempt has been made to Americanize the subordinate force in the consulates, and to a considerable extent this has been done. It can not be carried on, however, unless a larger fund is placed at the disposal of the department for compensation, for it is obvious that a competent American clerk will not serve in the consulates abroad unless given compensation upon which he can live respectably. The amount now appropriated would provide only one clerk at \$1,250 a year for each office. It must be apparent that many consulates must have a number of clerks and that competent men who serve as vice consuls in the larger offices, and particularly when living expenses are high, can not be obtained for so small a sum.

Another reason for a larger and more competent force of subordinates is afforded by the complicated and onerous duties which the present war has placed upon consulates. The care of the interests and subjects of belligerent nations, safeguarding and protection of the commerce and shipping of the United States, the protection of American citizens—all require a vast amount of additional work. A considerable amount is being allowed for increased clerical assistance out of the special war appropriation made by Congress, but more will be required after that appropriation shall have been exhausted.

The conditions growing out of the war make it of the highest importance that a larger number of American citizens be employed as clerks in the consulates. In many places the services of clerks of foreign nationality have had to be dispensed with because of objections upon the part of foreign Governments. In replacing these clerks with Americans larger compensation will have to be paid, rendering a larger appropriation necessary.

We also incorporate an item of \$360,000 for the purchase of consular premises at Shanghai and \$2,275 for a similar purpose at Yokohama. There are some entirely new items in the bill. One is for a hundred thousand dollars for an exposition at Panama, which is to be held during the coming spring and summer. Twenty-five thousand dollars of this money will be used for an exhibit at this exposition and \$75,000 to erect a permanent building at Panama City. I will read Secretary Bryan's letter in reference to this item:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 20, 1915.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: I have made inquiries in regard to the Panama Exposition, about which you spoke to me a few days ago, and find that the exposition is to open on July 6, 1915. Its character is to be Latin American, and its purpose is to bring under one organization a series of permanent exhibits of products from Latin-American countries, so that travelers crossing the Isthmus may have an opportunity to inspect with a minimum of difficulty and expense the products of the various countries of Latin America.

The only exception to the purely Latin-American character of the exposition is the inclusion of Spain as an exhibitor. It is expected that Spain will spend some \$80,000 for the erection of a permanent building which, after the close of the exposition, will be used to house the legation and will contain a permanent exhibition of Spanish products and be the center of Spanish trade publicity in the Caribbean region.

It is understood that Cuba and Venezuela will also erect permanent buildings at the exposition. Cuba intends to spend about \$60,000 for a building, which will later on become the home of the Cuban Legation and contain a permanent exhibit of Cuban products. It is not known how much will be expended by Venezuela.

It is understood that Guatemala will spend perhaps \$25,000 on her exhibit, and Nicaragua, and probably other Latin-American countries, will be represented by displays of merchandise and other articles of their production.

Panama itself has already expended about \$650,000 on a permanent exhibit and upon buildings now under construction, which will be used in the future as Government offices.

The distinct Pan American character of the exposition makes it of the highest importance that the United States should take a conspicuous part in the exposition. It is obvious that a permanent exhibit of the United States on the Isthmus of Panama, which will be crossed by so many passengers interested in trade, in the near future, could not fail to stimulate interest in articles of American production, and the appropriation for American participation should be ample for the installation of a thoroughly comprehensive display of articles produced in the United States.

In view of the character of the exposition it would seem desirable that as much latitude as practicable be given to the expenditure of the money appropriated for the purpose, and I would suggest that if there should be no objection on the part of Congress the appropriation be made without limitation to any particular year, so that it may be expended during the entire period of the exposition, which conceivably may extend beyond the calendar year of 1915.

I am, my dear Mr. Flood,
Very sincerely, yours,

W. J. BRYAN.

Hon. HENRY D. FLOOD,
Chairman Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives.

There is an item of \$50,000 for a conference of American financiers and an authorization of the President to invite the financial secretaries of the South and Central American countries and leading bankers of these countries, not exceeding three from each country, to meet here with our Secretary of the Treasury in a conference, and authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to invite bankers of this country to meet with them. This is deemed very important by the executive department. I understand that the system of bills of exchange used by this country and those used by the South and Central American countries are different. This and other subjects will be discussed, so that proper commercial relations can be established between our country and the Republics to the south of us, and our commercial relations with those countries increased and strengthened. I desire to read Secretary McAdoo's letter on this subject:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, January 15, 1915.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: With the approval of the President, I submitted to the Secretary of State, on the 6th of November last, a suggestion that an invitation be extended to each of the Central and South American Governments to send to Washington its finance minister, or some duly accredited financier, for a conference with the Secretary of the Treasury, looking to an improvement in the financial relationship between the United States and the Central and South American countries, and that these Governments be invited, also, to send three representatives of the banking interests of each country to join in the conference. I also suggested that if the Central and South American Governments should be favorably disposed to the idea, the Secretary of the Treasury would invite representative American bankers to participate in the proposed conference. In my letter to the Secretary of State I expressed the conviction that improved financial relations between the Central and South American countries and the United States is of primary importance, and that the proposed conference would be productive of great good. The Secretary of State informs me that he has communicated with the various Governments concerned, and that the idea has been favorably received. I inclose a letter from the Secretary of State, bearing the approval of the President, suggesting the passage of a joint resolution authorizing the President to extend a formal invitation to the Central and South American Governments to participate in the proposed conference, and authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to invite representative American bankers to attend. For the purpose of entertaining the foreign conferees an appropriation of \$50,000 is requested.

The unusual conditions prevailing throughout the world to-day make the proposed step exceedingly timely, and it should result in greatly improving and strengthening our relations—financial, commercial, and social, with our neighboring Republics in Central and South America.

In my first letter to the President the suggested date of the conference was February 1, but in view of the unavoidable delays which have occurred in the meantime it will be necessary to fix a later date. The joint resolution, therefore, authorizes the President to call the conference at such a date as he may think advisable.

Permit me to suggest the desirability of prompt action in this matter, particularly in view of the fact that the various Governments with which the Secretary of State has already communicated have evinced a most cordial and friendly disposition in the matter.

Faithfully, yours,

W. G. McADOO.

Hon. HENRY D. FLOOD,
Chairman Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has considered all of these increases very carefully. The other items in the bill are the usual items carried in the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill. I believe that this bill should be passed without amendment and without having any of these items stricken out on a point of order, and I hope such will be the pleasure of the committee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOLT].

Mr. BARTHOLOLT. Mr. Chairman, permit me to remark at the outset that what I am going to say has no reference whatever to a situation in which our own country may be involved.

In discussing the affairs of the Nation on this floor we find our task on some occasions more weighty with responsibility than on others. This is true with me at this particular time, when I undertake to discuss from an American viewpoint the situation in this country resulting from the great European war. I do not know whether I am equal to the task, but, mindful of all real obligations of neutrality, I shall confine myself to such matters in which my judgment can claim at least a modest degree of competence. And as this will probably be the last time I shall have the honor to address the House I crave the attention of my colleagues.

The United States has a composite population. Not England alone, but all Europe is its mother, and contributions to the blood which now circulates through the Nation's veins have been made by practically all countries, the largest share next to Great Britain having been contributed by Germany or the States now constituting the German Empire. American statesmen recognized early in our history that ours was not a ready-made nation, but a "nation to be" whose character was to be shaped by the impress made upon it by the various elements constituting its growing population. It was also recognized that Saul could not at once turn into Paul, that the newcomer could not change his traits overnight. It is probably true that the Anglo-Saxon is less free from racial or national prejudices than the cosmopolitan German—a strange phenomenon, for they come from the same cradle—yet such was the tolerance of our older statesmen that they never regarded the love of the immigrant for the old country as in any wise irreconcilable with his allegiance to the new. And why? Because reverence for the mother never detracts from love for the bride, and, furthermore, because that reverence is a natural impulse which can no more be regulated or controlled than can the throbs of the human heart. We can educate an immigrant in our way of thinking, induce him to adopt our customs and make a good American citizen of him, but we can not change his heart to the extent of eradicating his regard for his native land. Along with freedom of thought and conscience we must grant him the liberty of placing his sympathies and affections where he pleases. It is a natural right which no law can limit and no government can deny him as long as our own country is not involved. American statesmanship had the choice of either closing the gates of the country or of taking its chances with the constant human influx. It chose the latter course, and history does not record a single instance to prove that policy to have been a mistake. While the people of the United States have been gathered from all nooks and corners of the globe, while many of them still differ in habits, customs, and language, and while on occasions the sympathies of the first, second, and even third generations still go out to the land of their ancestors, no serious problem has thereby been created. Our adopted citizens and their native descendants have stood the test of loyalty in every crisis in the country's history, and thus irrefutable proof has been adduced that memories of the fatherland conjured up by impulses of the heart do not and will not detract from the allegiance due to the adopted country. [Applause.]

I ask you to keep this essential point in mind when I proceed to define the attitude in the present crisis of one great element of our population, that of the American citizens of German blood. Owing to press denunciations they are entitled to a hearing, and therefore it is incumbent upon some one familiar with their sentiments and aspirations to interpret these sentiments for the information of this House and the country. I shall not discuss the war, either as to its causes or the merits of the contentions of either party, but confine myself strictly to American or home issues which now confront us in consequence of the stupendous struggle. Because of their sympathies with the fatherland, the Americans of German descent have been openly accused of divided allegiance and downright disloyalty. They know this wanton insult to emanate from English and French press agents, and consequently treat it with the contempt it deserves. But what they resent is that, in the face of our own history, the American press should have opened its columns to such calumnies. Germans have fought and bled on the battle fields of four American wars and furnished a larger proportion to the fighting strength of our country than any other of the so-called foreign elements. In the Revolutionary War, with Baron Steuben they espoused the cause of the Colonies, and the implicit confidence which the Father of our Country placed in their loyalty is a matter of history. In 1861, when many of the English, with instinctive aversion to American naturalization, took out British protection papers, the Germans—that is, nearly 200,000 of them—rallied around the flag of Abraham Lincoln to save the Union. They displayed the same valor in the War of 1812 and in the Spanish-American War, and their loyalty to the flag in times of war is equaled only by their loyalty to American ideals in times of peace. [Applause.] I should have much preferred if just at this time these historical truths had been uttered by other than a German-American tongue; but while our pro-English press is ignoring them, Americans of German blood should at least have expected immunity from libels and insults. Yet such insults are heaped upon that element by newspapers permitting agents of the allies to use their space for that purpose. We can best judge the future by the past, and the lessons of the past justify me in proclaiming it as an irrefutable fact that if unfortunately the United States should ever again be embroiled in war, which

the Heavens forbid, the Germans of this country would again as loyally rally around the Stars and Stripes as they did against our enemies in every crisis of the past. [Applause.] Let me again assert in most positive terms what I said on the floor the other day, that the Germans are for America against England, for America against Germany, for America against the world! They will never waver for one second in their allegiance to the land of their choice and adoption. [Applause.]

These few words will suffice, I trust, to lay bare the charge above referred to in its whole naked infamy. But let me proceed with my argument. If sympathy for Germany is an evidence of disloyalty, as is claimed by our traducers, you will agree that sympathy for the allies is exactly the same thing; and if that be true, we would be confronted with the monstrous fact that the whole American press printed in English, with but few exceptions, is disloyal to the United States. It is absurd, of course, but I make this deduction merely to show that I am not a less patriotic American by sympathizing with the fatherland and its ally than I would be if my sympathies were for England and her allies; and certainly no true American will claim that to side with England and to oppose Germany is a prerequisite of loyal American citizenship, for that would mean both trucking to a former enemy and the betrayal of a traditional friend, a course absolutely unjustifiable by any standard of American loyalty.

There is no question, Mr. Chairman, but what at the present time the Germans of this country are stirred as they were never stirred before. Their state of mind manifests itself in great mass meetings and in hundreds of thousands of petitions addressed to Congress in favor of an embargo on arms. It would not be quite correct, however, to ascribe the prevailing excitement solely to sympathy for Germany. In reality it is as much, if not more, injured pride and an outraged sense of justice which have caused their indignation to rise because of the outrageous prevarications of truth and the cruel misrepresentations of Germany, her people, and institutions contained in the manufactured news from England and reprinted in the American newspapers. Proud of their American citizenship, they have in a political sense absolutely nothing in common with Germany or its government, but their more or less accurate knowledge of conditions in that country taught them that the alleged news we were getting was a brutal attempt at defamation to poison the American mind against Germany. The war was started with a monstrous lie, and in order to support it a thousand other lies had to be told. The Germans were denounced as Huns and barbarians, as ravishers and plunderers, and as perpetrators of the worst imaginable atrocities. The Emperor was described as an Attila, who on one day had had 110 Socialist deputies executed; the Crown Prince as a thief, and so forth. You might say that it is natural for enemies to revile each other, but I must answer that, so far as Germany is concerned, she herself, though obliged to fight the lie as one of the worst of her many enemies, has not yet stooped to a departure from the truth either in her own newspapers or in the messages she has sent out to the world. And permit me to add parenthetically that to the neutral world the present struggle has an enhanced significance in that it is also a warfare of falsehood against the truth. If the international lie should succeed, I believe the world would eventually suffocate in its slime.

The Germans of this country could understand why England to secure recruits should want to incite her own people by these falsehoods, but they could not understand nor will they forgive the American newspapers for reprinting them in our country. To do so was a most serious and an unpardonable reflection on the German element of this country. As an integral part of the American people, whose characteristics and virtues are reflected as much in the composite character of this Nation as are those of the citizens of English descent, they believed themselves to be entitled to some consideration at the hands of the press of their own country. Such consideration was denied them, however, and with utter disregard of their feelings they were rudely informed that their brothers on the other side of the ocean are barbarians, ghouls, and vandals, and that is not all. From the first day of the war up to the present whatever the allies did was all right, while every act of the Germans was all wrong, even if it was an exactly similar thing; for instance, the dropping of explosives from aeroplanes. The alleged violation of Belgian neutrality was harped upon with sickening persistence even after it had been ascertained that the neutrality treaty had expired in 1872, and that, if it had still been in force, the Belgian Government had itself thrown it overboard by its secret agreement with England regarding the landing of English troops on Belgian soil. On the other hand, not a word is said about the violation of Chinese neutrality by Japanese and English troops, although

this matter is of infinitely greater consequence to American interests than the affairs of Belgium can possibly be. The present international status of China is due to the skill of American statesmanship, it being an achievement of John Hay, made possible by the support of Germany alone. The integrity of China, already violated by England and her ally, should be restored and maintained at all hazards, but we look in vain for any appeals in the press in favor of the conservation of American interests in that quarter. It might embarrass England, you know, if just now the press insisted on our own rights. As to Belgian atrocities, five American newspaper men of the highest standing affirmed under oath that there was no such thing, yet these alleged atrocities are presented to American readers in glaring headlines, while the authentic refutation of the stories is published in small type on the sixteenth or seventeenth page. We may be foolish, but we are not blind to such notorious evidences of partiality. The Americans of German blood are a unit in bitterly resenting not only these unneutral efforts to poison the fountainheads of American public opinion against Germany but also the palpably unneutral "most-favored-nation" treatment systematically accorded to Great Britain. Touching the last-named fact, it seems to them as if we were using kid gloves against England and the mailed fist against Germany, as if, indeed, everything was being avoided, even to the disregard of American interests, that might embarrass the former country in her effort to crush Germany.

The bill of complaints is too long to recite here in full, but let me merely ask: Have we protested against American citizens having been dragged from neutral steamers and thrown into English prisons simply because those men, Americans to the manner born, happened to bear German names? No. Have we protested against England's inhuman policy to starve to death the noncombatant population of Germany by stopping, in open violation of international law, all food supplies, even if carried from a neutral country and in neutral bottoms? No. Have we protested against England declaring the whole North Sea as a war zone? No; but when Germany did the same thing in practically the same language we immediately dispatched a stiff note to Berlin, while the milder one was directed to England, though it would seem that the latter country was the chief offender in allowing the use of false flags. However, whatever the administration does in foreign affairs, as Americans it will be our duty to uphold it.

After this explanation can you understand, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, why the German mind in this country is agitated, and can you blame that element if their feelings are ruffled? When, moreover, it dawned upon them that all our arms factories were running night and day to supply the allies with weapons for use against their brothers and kinsmen, nothing could convince them that the United States was not actually a silent partner of the allies. Then it was that they demanded, and they are still demanding an embargo on arms to enforce honest neutrality, the kind of neutrality which the President proclaimed when he said: "We should be neutral in fact as well as in name, and should put a curb on every transaction which might be construed as giving a preference to one party to the struggle above another." This shameful traffic in arms, they argue, gives the lie to our prayers for peace, because it tends to prolong the war, and its permission by international law, they believe, imposes no obligation on our citizens to carry it on, no more on us than on the other neutral countries which have all stopped it upon the demand of England herself. I should like to discuss this important question at length, if my time permitted, but let me say just one more word. Whether the President would use the authority or not, there ought to be a law on our statute books which confers such authority upon him in order that he might enforce his demands for a free and open sea and unrestricted commerce in noncontraband goods. In our present demands against England our only alternative is to either give in or declare war. The threat of an embargo on arms, however, would quickly bring the "Mistress of the Seas" to terms and without war. Hence the legislation demanded by what the pro-English press is pleased to call German mass meetings, will be a preventive of, rather than a provocation to, war with England, and thus fails to the ground another of the silly charges preferred by the press bureau of the allies against me and the several millions of American citizens who think as I do on this subject.

Continuing as an interpreter of the feelings of these millions, all good American citizens, permit me to say that the hostility of the Anglo-American press against Germany and the Germans has forced many to a conclusion which, if correct, would be the most painful disappointment of my life. They believe this attitude to be less pro-English than anti-German, and, indeed, regard it as the outgrowth of racial preju-

dice against the Germans even of this country, and as a revival of the old know-nothing spirit which aimed at a sort of guardianship by those of English descent over this country, to the exclusion of all other elements, the latter to be classed simply as "foreigners," and degraded to the rank of second-class citizens. How could such a conclusion be reached? Well, they ask whether the history of the American Germans has not been an honorable one. They fought for independence, opposed slavery, and loyally gave their bodies and lives that the Union might live; they were almost a unit for sound money, and are imbued with the true American spirit of freedom to such an extent that they love liberty better than whatever good might come from its restriction. As a rule, they modestly refrained from seeking political preferment, but filled America's life with music and song and innocent social pleasures. They are peaceful and law-abiding citizens, who by industry and thrift have made the best of the opportunities which the country of their choice generously offered them, and thus they have contributed their honest share to the growth, the development, and the grandeur of the Republic. [Applause.] If such a record of good citizenship is not sufficient, it is argued, to insure the German element immunity from libels and insults, what else can account for it but racial aversion, the innate prejudice of the Anglo-Saxon against everything foreign?

Another argument: Why, it is asked, with intense seriousness, do American newspapers repeat and accept at par all the pretexts which England hurriedly invented for waging war against Germany, such as "The small States must be protected," "German militarism must be crushed," and so forth? Should not an American, free, neutral, and independent, form his own judgment rather than blindly accept the logic of a belligerent? Does not the proverbial American sense of justice and fair play require us to impartially hear both sides before we render our verdict? Every schoolboy knows the kind of protection England has afforded to smaller States. It is the kind which the spider gives to the fly. And then German militarism! As pacifists we can condemn it along with Russian, French, and English militarism, but of these the German military system is the least objectionable, because, never having been used for a war of conquest, it has been nothing more than a bulwark of national defense, of which every young man of military age feels it a duty and an honor to be a part.

For hundreds of years German soil has been the battle ground of all great European wars, and the poor people of that country suffered as the Belgians, the Russian Jews, and others suffer to-day, only that nobody sympathized with them. Finally they united for self-defense and self-preservation, and out of the smoke and fire of the Franco-German War emerged, as a realization of their fervent hopes and earlier dreams, the United States of Germany. But for the more lasting enjoyment of the blessings of peace the new German Empire combined with Austria-Hungary and Italy, the three forming the Triple Alliance for mutual protection and defence. In spite of her much-decried militarism Germany has kept the peace for 45 years, and she would to-day enjoy the fruits of her peaceful development and consequent prosperity if it had not been for the combined lust of conquest, lust of revenge, and jealousy of the three powers which are now trying to crush her. This is the story of German militarism. But, say my friends, when we relate this story we are cried down and given to understand that our very knowledge of these details is treason, because it shows that we pay attention to other than American interests.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we must admit that Germany is not getting a square deal from us, that she is to be condemned, right or wrong. The reasons are a psychological riddle, which has distressed me more than anything I ever experienced in my life, the more so because Germany has been our consistent and faithful friend from the beginning of our history. Carl Schurz, as long as 60 years ago, wrote to his friend Kinkel:

It is my belief that the future interests of America and Germany are closely interwoven. However different the two nations may be in character, they will have the same opponents, and that will compel them to have a corresponding foreign policy. America's influence in Europe will be based on Germany, and Germany's world position will depend essentially on the success of America. Germany is the only power in Europe whose interests will not conflict with those of America, and America is the only power in the civilized world that would not be jealous of a strong united Germany. They can both grow without being rivals, and it will be to the interest of each to keep the adversaries of the other in check.

When this was written, in 1855, Japan was not yet a world power, England had not yet tried to help break up the Union, and Germany had not yet had the opportunity to befriend us as signally as she did during the Civil War. Hence, if this was true 60 years ago, it is even more so to-day. And in this connection let me again quote Carl Schurz. In 1903 Pomeroy Bur-

ton had asked him about the possibility of a war with Germany, and this was his answer:

A war between the United States and Germany would be so awful, so incalculable a calamity, that only the most absolute and evident necessity could serve as an excuse for it. Not even the wildest jingo on either side will pretend that such a necessity exists or is in prospect. In fact, there is no real question of difference between the two countries important enough to disturb their ancient friendship. A war between them would, therefore, not only be criminal, but idiotic—an absurd atrocity, a murderous nonsense. Even to suggest the possibility of such a war under such circumstances and to agitate the public mind by such suggestions is a piece of mischievous recklessness.

[Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, before I digressed I was discussing the opinions of those who are inclined to ascribe the cause of the anti-German feeling in our country to racial prejudice. The counterfeeling ran high, as we all know, but I concluded that, even if there were some truth in that supposition, it must not be countenanced. If others wished to act in an un-American spirit, let them do so; the Germans, at least, should remain squarely on American ground and totally ignore every display of narrowness which, detestable in itself, would create a schism in this country and, if allowed to grow, eventually rend it asunder. There should never be a division in the United States upon racial or national lines. Russia, by using Serbia as a tool, has sown the seed of discord between the different races in Austria-Hungary, and we see what it has led to. Under the American sun, in their capacity as citizens, the Teuton and the Slav, the Irishman and the Englishman, the German and the Frenchman extend to each other the hand of brotherhood as equals, and the great flag covers them all. [Applause.] Ancient prejudices have melted away under the sun of freedom until, no longer English, Irish, German, Scandinavian, we are, one and all, heart and soul, Americans! [Applause.]

I believe this to be the true sentiment of all citizens of German blood; and in justice to them it should be said further that in the present crisis they would not have been heard from but for the provocation caused by the outspoken unneutral attitude of the pro-English press and the sales exclusively to Germany's enemies of arms and ammunition. It was easy to direct the movement started by them into loyal American channels, and that, Mr. Chairman, was the purpose of the conference recently held here in Washington. It was a most remarkable gathering. Although Americans of German blood largely predominated, it was not a pro-German, but decidedly a pro-American, meeting, as it was intended to be. Those present were distinguished representatives; in most cases the heads of the great church and civic organizations of all parts of the country; and probably for the first time in our history Republicans and Democrats, Jews and Gentiles, Catholics, Protestants, and Free Thinkers shook hands for a common purpose, and that purpose was to call for an enforcement, in accordance with the spirit of American patriotism, of every American right against all belligerents alike, and to insist on the observance of strict and genuine neutrality as defined by all American Presidents from George Washington to Woodrow Wilson. As plainly indicated by its complexion, the gathering was strictly nonpartisan; and that, too, will be the character of the national organization to be effected as a result of that historic conference. After many hours of earnest deliberation, during which all the speakers displayed a most admirable feeling of restraint, as well as of solemn responsibility, a "declaration of principles," formulated by the platform committee, was adopted by a unanimous vote, and I leave it to the House to say whether this declaration rings true or not. Here it is:

Whereas the spirit of absolute neutrality toward foreign nations at war with one another is a basic tradition of the American people; and
Whereas the course of recent events has made it evident that this cherished attitude has been endangered through a foreign control of our news service and of our communication by sea; and
Whereas our commerce and our citizens have been compelled to endure violation of the principles of international law; and
Whereas the ships of our country in common with those of other neutral nations, having on board the property of citizens of the United States, have been arrested on the high seas by a belligerent power, conveyed into its port and there subjected to a process of search involving delays and losses; and
Whereas citizens of the United States and of nations friendly to us have forcibly been taken off our ships in defiance of the protection accorded them by the American flag and put into prison or detention camps; and
Whereas articles hitherto considered absolutely free in international traffic have been arbitrarily made contraband; and
Whereas the rules of international law governing neutral commerce have been altered or disregarded in the special interest of one set of belligerents to the manifest injury of the United States as an independent Nation with rights to be respected and with citizens to protect; and
Whereas the shipment of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war under conditions now prevailing is unfair, unneutral, and in violation of America's ethical ideas, tends to prolong the war, and is irreconcilable with our prayers for peace; and

Whereas this condition of affairs is intolerable to all American citizens who believe in the principles of neutrality, fairness, and friendship applied to all nations alike, and in the noble mission of this country as a promoter of peace and a champion of justice and humanity: Therefore, in order to reestablish genuine American neutrality and to uphold it free from commercial, financial, and political subservience to foreign powers, be it

Resolved, That we, citizens of the United States, agree to effect a national organization the objects and purposes of which may be stated as follows:

1. In order to assure the possession of an independent news service, we favor an American cable controlled by the Government of the United States.
2. We demand a free and open sea for the commerce of the United States and unrestricted traffic in noncontraband goods as defined by international law.
3. We favor as a strictly American policy the immediate enactment of legislation prohibiting the export of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war.
4. We favor the establishment of an American merchant marine.
5. We pledge ourselves individually and collectively to support only such candidates for public office, irrespective of party, who will place American interests above those of any other country, and who will aid in eliminating all undue foreign influences from American life.

Mr. Chairman, this declaration hardly needs an explanation at my hands. That it is a truly American platform, and one on which all good and loyal citizens can stand, will be admitted by all whose judgment is not blinded by prejudice and partiality. Yet the pro-English newspapers, especially those of New York, denounced it in unmeasured terms. With blind fury they rushed to the defense of British interests, against these so-called hyphenated Americans, foreigners, and traitors who have the temerity to assert American rights at such an inconvenient time. The climax was reached by one of the great metropolitan dailies deliberately reversing the position which the conference took with regard to American and foreign interests. I can not resist the temptation to nail this instructive evidence of jugglery to the masthead. As we have seen, the last plank of the platform reads:

We pledge ourselves . . . to support only such candidates for public office, irrespective of party, who will place American interests above those of any other country.

But the newspaper just mentioned puts it this way editorially:

When the representatives of German-American societies publicly pledge themselves in effect to oppose all candidates for office who will not sacrifice American interests to German interests they are straining American patience to the breaking point.

This is the kind of journalism, Mr. Chairman, that we protest against from the standpoint of simple honesty. It is but a sample of the newspaper war which is being waged against Germany, too. Most of the comments might just as well have been written in London. The injustice of it all is solely responsible for whatever bitterness and indignation there may exist among those who believe in a square deal for Germany. American citizens of German blood simply refuse to accept the judgment of the English censor on the country of their fathers, because they know better; and when that judgment is presented to them by the newspapers of their own country, they protest because it does violence to the truth; and he would be a poor American, indeed, who would not stand up for right and truth rather than falsehood and wrong. As between the two he can not afford to be neutral. In order to guard against misrepresentations of our country, if ever we should be at outs with the country that now controls the news service of the world, an independent American cable, to be owned and controlled by the Government, is demanded as the first plank of the platform referred to. The other planks speak for themselves.

In conclusion let me reiterate the steadfast devotion of all citizens of German blood to American ideals and the flag. Impatient of injustice though they be, their hearts are true to the core. They feel themselves as one with every other citizen of the Republic, and, right or wrong, they will share the fate of their adopted country and of their children's fatherland. Whatever their secondary sympathies may be, they are with all other true Americans for America first, last, and all the time. [Applause.] They are for a united Nation, and shall ever uphold the ideal of national unity and dignity with that loyalty which has characterized their whole history on American soil.

I thank you for your patience and attention. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, how much time did the gentleman from Missouri consume?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has seven minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTHOLOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] for half a minute.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a speech delivered by Mr. Charles S. Hamlin, governor of the Federal Reserve Board, before the Chicago real estate board on February 13.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to print in the Record the speech referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I expect to talk about war conditions for a few minutes, but it is certainly not my purpose to refer to that extraordinary, unparalleled horror in Europe. I believe that in His generosity the Lord has provided soil enough and conditions good enough for all of the people in the world to find a place in the sun, and, so far as my feeble abilities enable me to contribute to the bringing of that about, I propose to do so. I mean to speak a word about purely American matters. I shall refer to conditions in that part of the world which more directly concerns us. I do not believe that the Lord has commissioned us to administer the affairs of the Spanish-American countries about which I shall speak, but He has made them our neighbors, and what they do and how they do it does concern us. There exists to-day a most unfortunate state of affairs in the neighboring Republic of Mexico. For four years or more a carnival of crime has gone on in that country. It has become a huge international scandal. It is a political sore which, if not healed, may infect both the South and North American Continents.

In that country, where patriotic movements are always violent, there are large numbers who protest their love of the constitution, a document to which their devotion is shown in some very peculiar ways. One band of—well, I will say one army after another, in order to speak in diplomatic language—has gone about the great area embraced in that Republic and done deeds which the conscience of no good man can approve. It has made a condition on the frontier which is dangerous, a condition which I am afraid may precipitate us into war at any time. I am submitting a plan which I believe will clear that situation up.

The President declared in his Indianapolis speech, and I perfectly agree with him in the statement, that it is none of our business how they—the Mexicans—go about their business or how long they take in determining it. That is true within limitations, and provided they do not trespass upon our rights and make conditions which will render war between us and them inevitable, and which I certainly hope will be avoided. The President also said it is none of our business how they go about their business. That raises another question, and I regret to say I can not agree with the President of the United States in that respect.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is a perfectly simple and easy matter to avoid any conflict at arms with Mexico or with any other part of the Spanish-American peoples. I believe that if we make concessions of a reasonable sort, that if we meet them in the right spirit, if we freely recognize the absolute equality of sovereignty, the sovereignty of the big and the sovereignty of the little States, we may bring about conditions which will not only restore quiet to Mexico, but which will prevent a recurrence of such trouble, and it will certainly keep us out of any possibility of trouble with any people in that part of the world hereafter. And to that end, Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks by printing in the Record an article which I prepared and which was published in the current issue of the American Journal of International Law. It suggests a Pan-American agreement which is as practical as it is pacific. Mr. Chairman, before I take my seat I want to say one word and pay one small tribute to the character of the people who were referred to so truthfully and so eloquently by my friend from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOTT], who has just taken his seat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Can the gentleman from Virginia yield me another minute?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The gentleman asked for three minutes and I yielded him five.

Mr. COOPER. I will yield one minute to the gentleman.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I want to say just a word: I have the honor, and I am proud to be able to say it, of representing a large constituency commonly referred to as German-Americans. There is no more robustly American or patriotic people in this country than the constituency which I represent, and everything the gentleman from Missouri has said as to their thrift, their integrity, their enterprise, and their usefulness as citizens,

I cordially indorse. In those counties in my district which are referred to as German counties there are no delinquent taxpayers. The criminal court has no business to do when it meets. They are law-abiding, industrious, useful, and patriotic citizens, and I am glad to have the opportunity to say so in these days of excited and foolish talk. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the article referred to. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The article referred to is as follows:

THE A B C MEDIATION.
[By JAMES L. SLAYDEN.]

"How to regulate social, political, and commercial intercourse between the people and Government of the United States and the peoples and Governments of the other Republics on the American Continent so as to establish and maintain perfect cordiality and mutual confidence and respect, is a problem which has never been satisfactorily solved.

"In considering this question, which is often to the front and sometimes discussed with acerbity, certain disagreeable facts must be faced. In the process of understanding it American vanity will be hurt, but that is no reason for avoiding the effort to do so. There is abundant reason for believing that Americans are not popular in Mexico and other Latin-American countries. It is not the purpose of the writer in this brief essay to undertake to show why this is so. Suffice it to say that the people of the United States are viewed with suspicion, and this doubt of them and their purposes has militated against the development of American trade in the southern Republics, and is a cause of irritation which ought to be cured. Diplomatic friendship has existed and does exist, but that is a relationship which can always be counted on until an open breach is imminent. Less than 30 days before the outbreak of the greatest war in all history there was an assumed—a diplomatic—cordiality between the monarchs of Russia, England, Germany, and Austria. There is no danger of a cataclysm in America such as is deluging Europe with blood; but that unparalleled disaster shows that something more than formal friendships, something far more than diplomatic amenities, is desirable in the intercourse of nations.

"The right relations are based in justice, in respect for the rights and views of other countries, and in forbearance. These are elemental international virtues that must be cultivated if cordial relations are to be maintained. They are the antidotes for the poison of doubt and suspicion.

"For four years Mexico has been cursed by one revolution after another, and conditions in that unhappy country have gone from bad to worse. There has been a vociferous demand for intervention by the United States. This demand has come from citizens of the United States residing or doing business in Mexico and from other sources. It has been assumed by these citizens and by some Governments that it is the duty and the right of the United States to interfere in Mexico to command the peace.

"Against great pressure two Presidents of the United States have declined to intervene, although Americans and Europeans, supposedly under the protection of our Government, have been plundered and murdered. The civilized world has looked to this country for relief from Mexican anarchy. The fact that no intervention has occurred—except in one instance and for the specific purpose of resenting an insult to the American flag—should convince the people of Spanish America that neither the people nor Government of the United States desire to meddle in the domestic affairs of other countries.

"Of course, there are circumstances under which intervention may become necessary. When treaty rights are not respected, or when the property of aliens is destroyed and their lives taken, their Governments may interpose even with armed forces. Under such conditions intervention would be justified in the custom of nations and approved by all civilized powers.

"Although apt to lead to it, intervention is sometimes undertaken to prevent war, and is justified as a restraint of wrongdoing and illegal or immoral acts.

"While these provocations have all no doubt existed, the United States, the big brother of the family of the American Republics, has so far refused to undertake the task of restoring order in Mexico.

"But is there not a better, a less expensive, and more effective way of extending protection to aliens in Mexico than armed intervention by a single power? The writer believes that there is, and two recent precedents may be cited. In one of these instances, the intervention in China in 1900, the plan was completely successful, and in the other it was partially so. In the Chinese intervention, made jointly by the United States and

sundry European Governments, the issue was a happy one for everybody, even for China herself.

"But it is to the situation in Mexico and the effort at mediation proposed by the ambassadors from Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, that specific reference is now made with the hope of indicating its value as a means for the preservation of peace.

"And here it may be well to say that the Mexican situation presents a purely American question, and must be settled by the Governments of the American continent.

"Everyone would like to see Mexico herself quickly and completely settle her internal troubles and avoid all interference from any other country or association of countries. But what if she will not, or can not? Shall intervention be by the United States alone, which will mean war and a new crop of suspicion and hatred of the Anglo-Saxon, or shall it be in association with the orderly Spanish-American countries? In the latter case the futility of resistance will be apparent, and quick and peaceful solution will certainly follow.

"Unfortunately all the details of the work done at Niagara are not known to the general public, and a correct estimate of its importance is difficult. But enough is known to suggest that the precedent is likely to become of transcendent importance in the political future of the American continent.

"The 'A. B. C.' mediation has taken its place in history, and in the opinion of the writer will be fully justified in the future. Certainly it was not a failure, and the more it is studied the stronger becomes the impression that it begins a diplomatic epoch in the history of the Americas.

"In their communication to the Secretary of State of the United States tendering good offices, the three ambassadors said that they did so 'for the purpose of serving the interest of peace and civilization on our continent, and with the earnest desire to prevent any further bloodshed to the prejudice of the cordiality and union which have always surrounded the relations of the Governments and the peoples of America.'

"It was a noble purpose, opportunely undertaken, and while never dramatic was in an important way successful. A war between the United States and Mexico then seemed imminent, and none occurred. A condition which was fast bringing ruin to Mexico, as it had brought shame, was distinctly and promptly bettered, and for some time thereafter there was no 'further bloodshed' in that unhappy country.

"To many students of the Niagara mediation it appears to have two distinct features of value. It helped, though possibly in a minor way, to bring the belligerents in Mexico into communication with one another, and it certainly made them realize that other countries were not indifferent to conditions in that Republic. It made them understand that chaos and bloodshed would not be permitted to go on forever. It compelled the Mexicans to realize that if they are to keep their sovereignty they must behave as a sovereign should, and not maintain an international nuisance. It forced them to think, and there was no more important fighting between the insurgents and the Huerta administration after the mediators met. Occasional minor conflicts between the followers of irresponsible guerilla chiefs and the military are not chargeable to Huerta or Carranza, and they may still be expected, for banditry of long standing is never ended in a day. Indians who have tasted the free, wild life of the camp, the companionship of a horse and a rifle, and an opportunity for loot and vengeance do not willingly or immediately go back to herding sheep or digging in mines.

"The second and by far the greatest value of the Niagara conference is the precedent it made. It points the way to the settlement of similar troubles in the future. It may, I think, be regarded as the beginning of a Pan American policy for the quieting of internal troubles and international disputes between the Republics on this continent.

"The proof it gave to the suspicious and doubtful citizens of the 20 Spanish and Portuguese speaking Republics that the people and Government of the United States contemplate no assault on their sovereignty and territory sufficed in itself to lift the mediation out of the class of failures. It did not accomplish all that some people believed it would or all that some of us hoped it might; but, in spite of the jeers of unsympathetic newspaper wits and the scorn of militarists, it did enough to establish a policy. Hereafter when any American country gives itself over to anarchy, those governments that prefer order to disorder, following the precedent of the 'A. B. C.' mediation, can jointly intervene to command the peace. If necessary to enforce this command, the military arm of all or a majority of the peaceable countries of America may be employed for that purpose. Under these joint operations no great financial burden will be put on any one peacemaker, and, better still, there can be no suspicion of motives, no apprehension of a loss of territory.

"That the people of Mexico, Central, and South America have entertained feelings of hostility toward this country, and a suspicion of its political purposes, is well known to observant travelers in those countries. The Mexican War of 1846, the exercise of overlordship in Santo Domingo and Haiti, 'dollar diplomacy' in Nicaragua and elsewhere, are all pointed to as reasons for this suspicion. The talk of some Americans of 'manifest destiny,' with its echo in the press, and the suggestion that the United States must, because of its ownership of the Panama Canal, control all territory down to the Isthmus, have not tended to remove that suspicion. South and Central Americans quite naturally say that the same reasoning applies to the territory south of the canal, and is equally valid.

"Such talk and the suspicion it has created have unquestionably interfered with the development of American trade in all Spanish America. It is human nature not to be inclined to favor, in trade or otherwise, people whose purposes are thought to be unfriendly. This feeling was perceptibly allayed by the proceedings at Niagara, and that, with the valuable precedent established, are distinct gains from the 'A. B. C.' mediation. Overlordship, so offensive to these Central and South Americans, was inferentially disclaimed, and the President and the Secretary of State made it perfectly clear that all this Government wants of its continental neighbors is friendship and mutual trade opportunities.

"The great and epoch-making speech of Mr. Wilson at Mobile cleared the atmosphere and made the mediation possible. That was a great and statesmanlike speech; but alone it was not sufficient to remove hurtful doubt and suspicion. It needed the persistent and sincere efforts of the Secretary of State, whose work for peace has given him an eminent and enviable place in history, and the prompt and hearty agreement to the mediation proposal to accomplish that.

"The way is now open for the future settlement of these revolutionary disturbances, the frequency and character of which have been a disgrace to the republican system of government. Why shall we not make the work begun at Niagara a permanent Pan American policy? Something like it worked very well in China at the time of the Boxer movement. There was no seizure of territory after the joint movement to Peking. But who can doubt that if the task of rescuing the legations had been left to any one of the great powers of Europe or to Japan China would have paid for it with a big slice of her territory?

"In the opinion of many earnest advocates of peace who feel a profound interest in all the American Governments this plan, if mutually agreed upon and carried into effect, would go far to remove this continent from the theater of possible war and would be a long step toward universal peace. It would put an end to the persistent clamor for armed intervention in Mexico by the United States. It would take the sting out of intervention and more quickly and effectively accomplish all that could be expected from the most successful interference with arms by any one country. It would give a sense of relief and territorial security to the smaller Latin-American countries, and, as all the larger and more powerful Governments declare themselves supporters of the policy of peace and justice, it is hard to see how they could object to it.

"It is in line with the peace plan of Mr. Secretary Bryan and keeps step with the doctrine of The Hague—the doctrine of arbitration, which in theory all good men indorse. A Pan American policy of mediation and arbitration whenever disturbances shall unfortunately occur ought to convert what has been until recently one of the most turbulent sections of the earth into a region of peace and prosperity.

"There is one distinct and mutual benefit to be shared by all the Governments of the American continent sure to follow the establishment of sincerely cordial relations between them. It will strengthen them for resistance in the event of an assault on the sovereignty or territory of any of them by any or all the powers waved off by President Monroe in 1823. That will amount to an understanding for mutual defense among 175,000,000 people on one continent flanked on all sides by the world's greatest oceans."

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman from Virginia occupy some more time?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The gentleman from Wisconsin can consume some time now.

Mr. COOPER. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. AINEY].

Mr. AINEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have so recently returned from the Far East, traveling extensively in Japan, Korea, Manchuria, and China, traversing the extent of Russia from one extreme of Siberia to the other, crossing on the great Trans-Siberian Railroad, the longest railroad in the world, that in view of the utterances which

have been made upon the floor of this House so recently with regard to the peoples of the Far East I am constrained to make some observations at this time, not in a controversial way, but for the purpose of broadening the perspective of our vision with respect to oriental affairs. These are momentous times. After the cataclysm and seismic convulsions of the warring world shall cease this country of ours is likely to be called upon to take an important part in the rehabilitation and rearrangement of world affairs. We shall need a clear vision, a firm hand, a sympathetic heart, and a temperate tone in order that we may meet that responsibility; and I deprecate any utterance or act which in these sensitive days shall add to the burdens of the President or tighten the tension of our international relations. We should consider the countries of the Far East, their relation to each other and to us, with a calm mind and freed from the prejudices which careless newspaper headlines and unwarranted newspaper utterances are calculated to create, swaying the judgment and stirring the emotions of our people. I feel that at this most critical time in the world's history, when feelings are keyed to highest pitch, when every international relation or activity is incased in tinder ready for the match, that the people and this high legislative body should stand with the President and with the Secretary of State, supporting them in their efforts to keep us off the reefs of war as they are forced to meet the delicate international situations which crowd thick and fast upon them.

I am constrained to believe that every Representative in Congress should carefully avoid any act or utterance calculated to disturb the equipoise of neutrality which we seek to maintain or which is likely to interfere with the solution of the grave problems which face the President and his Cabinet. I am surprised that anyone should carry the firebrand of war in these inflammable days. After this war in Europe, what? It would be a bold man who would now attempt to grasp the future to give an answer. We may assume, however, that the peoples of Europe will be depleted in men and money and that there is likely to be a change of influence, a change of emphasis, when Europe is weakened by war and her progress retarded by at least 50 years.

It may be that the weight of influence shall slip away from Europe, passing beyond the Ural Mountains and find lodgment among the peoples of Asia. Out of this war Russia, with her great resources, is likely to emerge the least harmed of any European power actively engaged in it. Russia territorially is largely Asiatic; ethnologically, she is allied in large measure with the Orient. Russia, slow-moving, ponderous Russia, that has been notching up in all these centuries until she now occupies one-sixth of the land area of the world with 8,417,000 square miles of territory; Russia, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Arctic almost to the Indian Ocean; Russia, with a population of 185,000,000 people; Russia, with a railroad extending 6,000 miles across the Continents of Asia and of Europe; Russia, that can put under arms from twenty-two to thirty millions of men; Russia is a factor in the future development of the world. Russia will pour her commercial activities into the Pacific.

It were interesting to recall that it was Kiaochow, and not Port Arthur, which was Russia's first love. It was almost within her grasp. Under the secret convention known as the Cassini convention, China had leased Kiaochow to Russia; with it went the concession to build the Trans-Siberian Railroad through Manchuria; accompanying it there was an undoubted purpose to build the Kalgan Railroad from Lake Baikal to Peking. A straight line would take this railroad to Kiaochow, thus giving Russia her long-desired open port to the Pacific.

It was about this time that Li Hung Chang made his celebrated trip around the world; he came to Berlin, and Germany became aware of Russia's purpose. The murder of two Lutheran missionaries on the Shantung Peninsula furnished the pretext. Germany seized Kiaochow, and Russia swallowed her chagrin and took Port Arthur as a consolation. This crowded her against Japan. The result is well known. To-day Russia and Japan find themselves in accord, and where Kiaochow may ultimately land is beyond the ken of any who are content to deal with facts. Certain it is there are evidences of renewed activity in railroad construction in the vicinity of Kalgan.

I must not take the time of this committee to speak more particularly of the marvelous transformation and growth of Russia since the Japanese War, of her great commercial activity, of her railroad development. The Trans-Siberian Railroad, double tracked nearly its entire distance, is now equipped with all modern improvements. Russia now is unified, enthusiastic, and prepared.

Nor may I take the time to suggest her purpose of reaching the Indian Ocean, from which she is separated by a few hundred

miles, of immeasurably more advantage to her than is usually considered. A railroad through Persia would be easily constructed.

We speak of Japan in the diminutive. We speak of her as "little Japan," and yet by the way of comparison let me call your attention to the fact that in area and population Japan is larger than the islands of Great Britain and Ireland, larger than France, almost equaling Germany. She has a population of 50,000,000 people, almost that of our own Nation shortly prior to the Civil War. Japan little? Why, when the northern portions of Europe were peopled with barbaric hordes and when Assyria was a world power, shortly after the 10 tribes of Israel were carried away into captivity, Japan put upon herself the habiliments of a mighty nation. Her present monarch can boast an unbroken line of royal ancestry longer than that of any other monarch in all the world. Japan with her splendid universities; Japan that has made marvelous strides in scientific attainment, whose bacteriological research lags behind no nation; Japan spoken of as "little Japan!"

We are confronted by the words "yellow peril." Sometimes I think the American people like generalizations. They are the creators of phrases. Within the term "yellow peril" we have bound up a great deal of misconception. Sometimes I think it has approached almost to the element of hatred, and out of this misconception two things arise—first, a belief that there is irresistibly to come a conflict between the yellow and the white races. That conception, it seems to me, had its ignoble birth in the day when monarchs were entirely supreme and when democracy had little part and power. It was when great monarchs yearned for other countries to conquer and had pre-empted all the earth for the white people, leaving neither hope, part, or place in this great world for any other.

The Japanese and Chinese are here. They exist. Japan has already entered into the society of nations. China will soon follow. Napoleon's expression, with which every schoolboy is familiar, "China is a sleeping giant; let her sleep," is no longer true. The world is dealing with an awakened giant. The question therefore comes to us, What shall be our attitude toward these Asiatic peoples? Shall we irritate them or shall we, as is worthy of a great Nation, give them the consideration which our high position permits and demands?

I am forced to say that for some years there has existed—the source of which I am not at liberty to reveal—a continued effort to create and foster ill will and misunderstanding between the United States and Japan. The newspapers of both countries publish many misleading dispatches. It was only recently that in one of the Tokyo papers there was published a dispatch, purporting to emanate from an American source, in which one of our admirals was quoted as stating that America was about to send a fleet across the seas to make an attack on Japan. What bosh, you say, and yet you are reading in some of your own papers statements of Japan's purposes equally unwarranted and unreliable. When the distinguished minority leader on this side of the House not very many weeks ago made some general utterances not at all antagonistic to the Asiatic people they were telegraphed to Japan, not in the language of his speech, but in language calculated to arouse resentment. There are marvelous misstatements sought to be placed before both peoples. And I rebel against them, because I have had the opportunity of visiting Japan and I believe I know their attitude as I know our own.

Will you let me tell you just one personal incident? It is illustrative of the Japanese. It does not belong in the realm of debate, but it is characteristic. I was invited to address the members of the Imperial Parliament of Japan a few months ago. On my visit to the Parliament House I was ushered into the hall of their representatives and seated in the gallery facing the speaker. The assembly was in a hall nearly as large as this. I listened to the tumult of their debate over the hotly contested naval budget. In the midst of the debate an old gentleman arose and took the rostrum and was escorted to the chair in order that he might speak. He was exceedingly lame, an old man 76 years of age, and as he came before that turbulent audience he raised his hand and stilled it. Then a smile came over the old man's face and he spoke a few words and it brought a ripple of laughter over here and a few more words and there was laughter all over the hall. Then I saw that he had captured his audience of legislators. The smile faded away and in the place of the smile the tense lines came, and, with the most impassioned utterance that it seemed to me I have ever listened to—although I could not understand the words; I felt them—he urged, from what I afterwards learned to be the fact, the development of his country along the lines that seemed to be necessary to him. And he swayed that audience. That

was my introduction to the grand old man of Japan, Count Okuma, a quotation from whom was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday by a gentleman of this House, and I shall refer to it in a moment.

I thought of him and his history. I thought of him as a little Samurai boy, with two swords, one carried on one side and one on the other, one to preserve his country's honor in case it was attacked and the other to take his own life, according to the Japanese standard in case his own honor was invaded. Such a boy was he when Perry knocked at the door of Japan, and I thought of him as the progressive man of Japan who had toiled for the intellectual and commercial development of his country until it has become a marvelous people and a marvelous nation, imbuing it with the idealism of a great purpose. Then I thought of a few years ago how a would-be assassin had thrown a bomb at him and despoiled him of a limb and nearly caused Japan the loss of his splendid services. I thought of his wonderful sense of humor and the grim pathos of his life, and, do you know, my mind insisted upon jumping across the Pacific to my own home land, and I thought of one who likewise had that saving grace of humor, a man who sought his country's welfare, a man loved by the people of this country, and whose name will ever be revered as long as American life shall continue to exist, a man whom the assassin's bullet despoiled us of, and I could not help turning to the Japanese gentleman next to me and saying, "Do you know that your Count Okuma at the present time reminds me in some respects of our own Abraham Lincoln?" And the next day the Japanese newspapers from one end of the land to the other carried that utterance. Why? Because they were pleased that the name of one of their great statesmen should be coupled in compliment with the name of one whom they revere above almost every other man in American history. [Applause.]

I would like to put in the RECORD now the utterance of Count Okuma, made just a few years ago and at a time when there was considerable agitation in our country and in Japan concerning the California situation. I shall not speak at all in a controversial way concerning that situation—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. AINEY. Can the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood] indulge me with a little more time?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman five minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. AINEY. I thank the gentleman. Count Okuma gathered together some of the great legislators, some of the great statesmen, some of the people in Japan interested in the world's affairs, and what was his utterance and advice to them? That of belligerency? That of war. That of a desire to invade this country in any way or involve us in any difficulty? Not at all. This was Count Okuma's utterance:

We can not solve this question by diplomacy. We can not solve it by arbitration. We can not solve it by war. We can not solve it by talk of war; that is the worst of all. We must appeal to the great Christian Nation to put in practice the principles for which it stands—the brotherhood of man; and out of this, in the process of time, if we will but content ourselves, the American people will, I am sure, find a solution.

[Applause.]

That was Count Okuma's utterance. But there are many people who seek to get away from such pacific statements made by responsible men of Japan and accept the irresponsible ones of jingoes who exist on either side of the Pacific. They say, "Oh, Japan wants to send her surplus population over here."

Will you permit me to call your attention to the fact that there is the great island of Formosa, the settlement and solution of which can only be made by Japan sending her surplus population to promote them. She is now in Korea, and if you had traveled in Korea as I have recently you would see how much depends on Japan sending her surplus population there. And then if you would go to Manchuria and the neighboring provinces you would see the demand there for Japan's surplus population, and if you go to the northern islands you will see the opportunity there for Japan's surplus population; Japan has a program.

But let me say before I close that Japan's future program is not so much with respect to America as it is with respect to the great country of China, with her 400,000,000 of people, differing materially in thought and purpose from Japan. I shall not seek to differentiate or take sides, except to call your attention to this, that outside of America I believe there is no more patriotic people in the world than the people of Japan, and in China they have not emphasized that national unity of thought and purpose. If you traveled in China now you would find along the zones of the railroads, which represent foreign con-

cessions, a line of English soldiers, a line of German soldiers, a line of Belgian soldiers, a line of French soldiers, and a line of Russian soldiers, each of them having control of portions of China. If we were confronted in Mexico with a population of 400,000,000 of people, would America think that we had a problem down there? And yet Japan, with the great nation of China just across the narrow sea, is confronted with that problem, and she has got to meet and solve that problem. If we will place ourselves in Japan's position and seek to analyze her point of view for a moment, we will get away from an insularity which hampers our vision. Personally I believe that our entanglements with the Far East are not likely to do us any good. I am not inclined to involve ourselves too far with them, but leave them to solution of the peoples most concerned.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. AINEY. I can not yield. I have only a few moments left. I do not want to get into a controversial colloquy with the gentleman in regard to my attitude or views. I have only a few minutes. I asked for half an hour in the beginning, but I could not get it, so that I shall not be able to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. AINEY. A problem likewise confronts China out of this war in Europe; what think you of the likelihood of these concessions, railroad and otherwise, now existing in China with respect to the zones of influence of European powers being likely to continue there? It is a matter of self-preservation for Japan to see that some line of activity is taken with respect to the future of China, and that nation which has apparently little cohesive power shall be tied together by the influence of that nation most capable of aiding. I am not prepared to say that Japan may not aid more than any European power. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AINEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. AINEY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. BURNETT having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 17122. An act for the relief of John Burrows.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. VAUGHAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. VAUGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VAUGHAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not know that I shall occupy the entire time given to me, but I wish to answer some of the remarks made a few moments ago by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOTT].

Mr. Chairman, in this war now going on in Europe the welfare of our country demands that we should be absolutely neutral. [Applause.] On that proposition all are agreed. If we love our country, we should do all in our power to preserve neutrality. On this proposition all should agree.

It is not for the American Congress to discuss who is to blame for bringing about this war. If we wish to preserve our neutrality, we should refrain from discussions that are calculated to disturb our neutrality.

But we are told that we are not giving Germany a square deal; that we are not observing neutrality toward Germany because some of our citizens are selling arms and munitions of war to the allies; that our Government should lay an embargo upon the exportation of such to all belligerents since Germany can not buy from us on account of British control of the seas. Now, if an observance of neutrality on our part requires that we lay this embargo we should do so, because we profess to be and we ought to be absolutely neutral.

But let us see whether or not an observance of strict neutrality on the part of the Government of the United States requires that we should lay this embargo. Let us examine international law upon the subject and see whether or not the policy of the administration is right. The newspapers carried the information on yesterday that the President had announced that the laying of such an embargo would be an unneutral act.

I undertake to say that any gentleman who will examine the authorities on the subject will come to the conclusion that the President is right, and that he is sustained by all of our Secretaries of State from Jefferson down to the present time.

In the first place I wish to say that our policy on this subject is based upon sound reason. This is not a military country. Our military system is the militia system; and if our country to-day were to become involved in war with any other country, one of the first things we would have to do would be to buy arms and ammunition abroad. In the War with Spain it was one of the first things we had to do, and we bought munitions of war from Germans, although Germany's sympathies were with Spain, and it was not considered unneutral for Germany to permit Germans to sell arms and munitions of war to the United States Government in that War with Spain. The policy of allowing our people to sell arms and munitions of war to belligerents is supported by the sound reason that a country like ours which does not maintain a large standing Army nor immense stores of arms and munitions of war will find it necessary whenever it becomes involved in war to buy arms and ammunition abroad.

If all the nations of the earth were agreed, and if international law were to the effect that the duty devolved upon every neutral Government to prohibit its citizens from selling munitions of war to belligerents, every Government in the world that does not maintain immense stores of munitions of war would find itself at the mercy of those nations that do maintain standing armies and stores of munitions of war.

It does not necessarily follow that it is because of British control of the seas that Germany does not buy arms and munitions of war from our people. The best information is that she does not need to buy abroad, that she is well supplied with immense stores of munitions of war and the means of making them, and would not find it necessary to purchase in the United States, even if Great Britain did not control the sea. In fact, her friends boast of her preparedness and of the impossibility of the allies overcoming her or successfully defending themselves against her.

When this war broke out in Europe the Governments engaging in it had the right to expect that the United States would be neutral, that we would adhere to the policy established in the beginning by Washington which in his Farewell Address he so earnestly advised us to adhere to. These Governments had the right to expect that if we professed neutrality we would practice neutrality as interpreted by the established policy of our Government in regard thereto. [Applause.]

But I said, and I repeat, that if the observance of strict neutrality requires that we lay this embargo, it ought to be done. The question is, Does neutrality require it? Of course, I mean neutrality as interpreted by the established policy of our Government, for no belligerent could expect us to vary from our established understanding of what neutrality requires.

I read from the letter of Mr. Jefferson, Secretary of State, to the British minister, May 15, 1793, volume 7, page 955, of Moore's International Law:

Our citizens have been always free to make, vend, and export arms. It is the constant occupation and livelihood of some of them. To suppress their callings, the only means, perhaps, of their subsistence, because a war exists in foreign and distant countries in which we have no concern would scarcely be expected. It would be hard in principle and impossible in practice. The law of nations, therefore, respecting the rights of those at peace does not require from them such an internal disarrangement in their occupations. It is satisfied with the external penalty pronounced in the President's proclamation, that of confiscation of such portion of these arms as shall fall into the hands of any of the belligerent powers on their way to the ports of their enemies. To this penalty our citizens are warned that they will be abandoned, and that even private contraventions may work no inequality between the parties at war the benefit of them will be left free and open to all.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAUGHAN. Yes.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. If any other policy should obtain throughout the nations of the world, would it not result logically that every country would find it necessary to be constantly employed in arming and panoplying itself in anticipation of wars yet to be declared in times of peace, knowing that it would be impossible to import arms from other countries after war was declared?

Mr. VAUGHAN. I agree with the gentleman entirely. I think I advanced that idea a moment ago. It would make it necessary that the Military Establishment of the United States should cost annually many hundreds of millions more than the immense sum it now costs to be prepared for defense.

Though Jefferson and Hamilton disagreed on many things, on this question they were agreed. I read from Hamilton's Treasury Circular of August 4, 1793 (1 American State Papers

on Foreign Relations, 140, vol. 7, p. 955, Moore's International Law):

The purchasing within and exporting from the United States, by way of merchandise, articles commonly called contraband, being generally warlike instruments and military stores, is free to all the parties at war and is not to be interfered with.

In 1796 France contended that the observance of neutrality on our part required that we should restrain our citizens from selling and exporting articles contraband of war to her belligerent enemies. We refused to yield to her demand, though she was our friend and ally in our struggle for independence. Now France wants to buy from us. We refused to restrain our people from selling to her enemies when she was engaged in a struggle for her existence against all Europe. We refused upon the ground that neutrality forbade. Shall we now, when she is engaged in another war, refuse to permit our citizens to sell to her?

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I could go on making quotations from the declarations of Secretaries of State from Jefferson to Bryan, but I content myself with saying that it is not only international law but it is the American policy, declared by every Secretary of State from Jefferson to Bryan, and it is based upon the fact that we are not a military power, and that we depend for our defense upon the militia system, that our citizens shall be permitted to sell to belligerents in time of war, and that belligerents are remitted in their protection in the matter to capture on the high seas. And if belligerents, in this war now going on, in which we are neutral, and should remain neutral, find themselves at a disadvantage, it is their misfortune and not the fault of the United States. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. KEY of Ohio having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 17982. An act to make Nyando, N. Y., a port through which merchandise may be imported for transportation without appraisement; and

H. R. 18172. An act to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Seymour, Ind.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills of the following titles:

S. 3897. An act to authorize the Great Northern Railway Co. to revise the location of its right of way, and for other purposes; and

S. 3362. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, through the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries, to make a survey of natural oyster beds, bars, and rocks, and barren bottoms contiguous thereto, in waters along the coast of and within the State of Texas.

The message also announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On February 17, 1915:

S. 1060. An act fixing the date of reenlistment of Gustav Hartfelder, first-class fireman, United States Navy;

S. 3525. An act for the relief of Pay Inspector F. T. Arms, United States Navy;

S. 543. An act to correct the military record of John T. Haines;

S. 145. An act for the relief of Charles Richter;

S. 1044. An act for the relief of Byron W. Canfield;

S. 1377. An act for the relief of Alfred S. Lewis;

S. 1703. An act for the relief of George P. Chandler;

S. 2304. An act for the relief of Chris Kuppler;

S. 2882. An act for the relief of Charles M. Clark;

S. 5695. An act for the relief of the Southern Transportation Co.; and

S. 5970. An act for the relief of Isaac Bethurum.

On February 18, 1915:

S. 1304. An act authorizing the Department of State to deliver to Capt. F. H. Uberroth, United States Revenue-Cutter Service, and Gunner Carl Johansson, United States Revenue-Cutter Service, watches tendered to them by the Canadian Government.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin consume some of his time now?

Mr. COOPER. I have used considerably more time than the gentleman from Virginia, but I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, owing to circumstances it was not possible for me to engage in the discussion on the floor of

the House when the ship-purchase bill was under consideration, but I have in my possession some very important facts that, I think, were not brought out in that debate that seem to me to demonstrate conclusively that there is no danger of any permanent lack of American ships to carry American goods in this present crisis.

In the RECORD of Wednesday, February 17, my colleague [Mr. CURRY] has printed a list of 58 vessels heretofore engaged in the coastwise trade that recently have been transferred to the foreign trade to meet the present crisis. The list is probably far from complete, as I myself know of one coastwise steamer not in the list that has been thus transferred—the *Edson Light*, transferred from the the Great Lakes to salt water.

I am also advised by the highest authority that there are now 30 coastwise ships on the Pacific coast tied up to the dock, with no business to do, that can be transferred to the Atlantic, and doubtless will be so transferred, if it is certain that foreign business can be secured for them that will be profitable.

It is also a fact that three of the steamers of the Great Lakes fleet were last fall taken through the Welland Canal, Lake Ontario, and the St. Lawrence River to salt water and are now carrying cargoes of cotton to Germany. I hold in my hand a printed weekly report of the trade conditions between Germany and this country showing this to be a fact. These three steamers are:

The *Robert M. Thompson*, built by the Great Lakes Engineering Works, of Detroit, Mich.

The *Edson Light*, built by the same company at Ashtabula, Ohio.

The *Kenauha*, built by the Jenks Shipbuilding Co., of Port Huron, Mich.

By this weekly report it appears that the *Robert M. Thompson* sailed from Rotterdam on her return to the United States on January 20, the *Kenauha* on January 30 from Rotterdam, while the date of sailing of the *Edson Light* from Goteborg via Rotterdam was indefinite. It is certain that these three ships are either on the way to Europe or already landed there with another cargo.

There are thousands of steamers on the Great Lakes flying the American flag. Many of these remained all last summer tied to the docks at lower lake ports because there was nothing for them to do. The indications now are that the coming season will be no better than the last for business on the Lakes. Under these circumstances it is perfectly certain that many of these steamers, as soon as the ice is out of the Welland Canal and the St. Lawrence River, will be taken to the Atlantic and put into the trade, provided there is prospect of business for them for any considerable period of time at profitable rates. While some of the lake steamers are too large to go through the Welland Canal, there are hundreds of them that can.

There are nearly 15,000 ships of all kinds flying the American flag engaged in the coastwise trade. Even a small percentage of this number diverted to the ocean carrying traffic would provide for every possible want in the way of ocean freight facilities for our commerce.

These facts must be known by at least some of the active proponents of this ship-purchase bill as well as they are known to me. If so, it is plain that there must be some ulterior or hidden purpose behind this remarkable, revolutionary, socialistic proposition to put the Government into the foreign shipping business other than that which is publicly stated to be the reason for its enactment. There is nothing more certain than that there are plenty of ships under the American flag that may be used to carry any amount of foreign commerce that can possibly be secured by our people without giving our support to this proposition—one of many urged upon this Congress—to put the Federal Government into business hitherto reserved to private enterprise.

In order that I may put these facts before the House, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, it was a great day in Lincoln, Nebr. The city's favorite son had torn himself from his confining duties as Secretary of State and was to deliver before the Lincoln Commercial Club one of his soulful addresses. It

must not for a moment be supposed that the surprise and pleasure of the town were due to the rarity of his public addresses. Far from it. But it was rumored that this address was to be delivered free of charge. Hence the rejoicing in Lincoln. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The fateful day of which I speak was January 6, 1914, and the equally fateful address is fortunately preserved to posterity in the March number of the *Commoner*. Much of Mr. Bryan's speech on that occasion may be passed over without comment; it is sufficient to say that, like most of the keynote speeches delivered by men prominent in the present administration, it deals in predictions and promises; the future tense is overworked to a lamentable degree.

For example, passages such as this are common:

Our Nation has awakened and walks face foremost toward the light. Sometimes the student, looking back through history, bewails the lateness of his birth and says that if he had only been born in some golden age of the past he would have been happy. There is no golden age like this; in all the years there has been no time like ours, no period in all the annals of man when one human being could render such service to the world as he can render to-day. It is the era of hope, the day of confidence, the time of rejoicing.

[Applause.]

So sang sweetly the Secretary of State. It may be that the hundreds of thousands of men and women out of employment, facing daily want and even starvation, forced to stand in the bread line, did not find the year 1914 quite so pregnant with hope, with confidence, with rejoicing, as did the Secretary of State. But that is at the moment neither here nor there.

Even in the mind of the Secretary of State such sentiments as I have quoted were but by-products of his address. The real meat of the discourse is elsewhere. Again I quote from the speech as reported, apparently verbatim, in the March *Commoner*, page 13:

You will find it in the *Commoner*. For authentic news of the progress of the new era, subscribe at once.

[Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I expected incredulity when I stated my opinion that the Secretary of State spoke before the Lincoln Commercial Club without receiving therefor compensation—or, as he doubtless prefers to designate it, "an honorarium." But the mystery is only on the surface; the speech merely provides a suitable stage setting for a deliberate and carefully planned attempt to boom the circulation of the *Commoner*, of which that same Secretary of State is "editor and proprietor." Shades of Thomas Jefferson, of John Quincy Adams, of Daniel Webster, of Richard Olney, and of John Hay!

This is the man who is the head of our great Department of State; this is the man charged with a thousand intricate and delicate details of adjusting our relations with every other power on the globe; this is the man upon whose judgment and foresight may perhaps hang the question of whether the United States will know peace or war the coming year. I do not charge, of course, that any moral opprobrium attached to the utterance which I have just quoted; I have the highest respect for the private character of the Secretary of State. But I do declare that a man so utterly devoid of even the slightest appreciation of the fitness of things is not and can not be anything but a hopeless misfit as the premier of the United States.

Mr. Bryan talks well—and frequently. He is very free with unctuous deliverances on the subject of our foreign policy; his heart yearns for the whole world, and especially, it would seem, does it yearn toward Latin America. For example, in a signed interview which appeared last March in *América E Industrias Americanas*—the price per word is not stated—Mr. Bryan spoke as follows:

It may take some time to convince all of the people of Latin America of this Nation's disinterested friendship. They have sometimes been made the victims of commercial greed; they have sometimes suffered from exploitation by concessionaires without conscience, and are therefore naturally suspicious, but these suspicions can be overcome and will be overcome. * * * They will find in this Nation an increasing regard for their welfare.

Nothing could be more delightful, more uplifting, more soul satisfying, than the sentiment so beautifully expressed. But have theory and practice agreed? I doubt if a single Member of this House would say yes.

The fund of material and information bearing upon this interesting point is abundant to an unhappy degree. A year ago, in a somewhat extended speech, I attempted to show the nature of the substitutions in our ministers to Latin America which had been wrought by Mr. Bryan. I think no one, Republican or Democrat, would regard with pleasure or equanimity the wholesale decapitation in practically every Latin-American post of trained nonpartisan diplomats in favor of crude and wholly untrained Bryanized relics of the free-silver campaign of 1896.

I can take up to-day only one very minute phase of a very great question. I desire to refer at this time to the island of Santo Domingo, or Haiti, one of the Latin-American sisters to whom the Secretary of State so movingly extended the right hand of fellowship.

Santo Domingo is one of those regions of the world which seems likely to have greatness thrust upon it. Surprising as it may seem, few regions of the earth are so little known to-day as this lovely island, lying between Cuba and Porto Rico, in spite of the fact that it is beyond question the finest of the Antilles, and that neither Cuba, Porto Rico, nor Jamaica can compare with it in mineral wealth or in fertility of soil.

But by one of those curious shifts in the current of trade, such as that which brings an obscure way station onto the trunk line of a railroad, the opening of the Panama Canal places the island in the midstream of world traffic. The two main channels by which the shipping of Europe and of America may enter the Caribbean Sea and thence the Pacific Ocean pass on either side of it. On the west is the Windward Passage, between the Haitian end of the island itself and Cuba; on the east is the Mona Passage, between the Santo Domingo end of the island and Porto Rico. On the Windward Passage end of Cuba we have Guantanamo Bay, and at the other extreme we have, of course, the whole island of Porto Rico. We have no military or naval foothold on the island itself. On the western end of the Haitian portion of the island, opposite Guantanamo Bay, is the harbor of Mole St. Nicholas, which is notoriously coveted by Germany; and on the eastern end of the Dominican portion, opposite Porto Rico, is the Bay of Samana, which would have been ours 45 years ago if the Senate, by a tie vote, had not rejected the treaty of cession negotiated by President Grant. As recently stated in the *Independent*, from which the foregoing facts are largely taken:

The island thus occupies a position of unique importance in both naval and commercial strategy. It is already apparent that whether the Panama Canal will attract enough traffic to repay us for the \$400,000,000 we have sunk in it depends more on fuel facilities—that is, on the coal and oil stations of the route—than on the rate of tolls.

Perhaps a few words relative to the history of the island will not be out of place as an introduction to the discussion of the present situation. The island of Santo Domingo, usually known in the old geographies as Haiti or Hayti, is the second largest of the Great Antilles. The eastern two-thirds of the island, with which I am primarily concerned just now, is given over to the little State known indifferently as the Dominican Republic or as the Republic of Santo Domingo. The Dominican Republic covers about 18,000 square miles of territory, an area substantially equal to the combined areas of New Hampshire and Vermont. The Republic of Haiti, as we have seen, occupies the western third of the island and is the oldest colored Republic. The country is almost exclusively agricultural and has an exceedingly fertile soil. The principal product is coffee, which is still cultivated in an exceedingly primitive way. Some sugar is also grown to meet the domestic demand. In neither Republic, on account of the frequent revolutions and the unprogressive character of the people, is the agricultural capacity of the country at all developed. Although the island is about 400 miles long and as much as 165 miles in width, the total mileage in railroads is only 315.

The modern history of the Dominican Republic may be said to begin with the accession to the presidency of the negro Heureaux in 1882. For 17 years this savage despot—whose administration may, in a limited way, perhaps, be compared with that of President Diaz in Mexico—ruled the Dominican Republic with an iron hand, keeping the peace by mingling bribery and terrorism. Those whom he considered useful he kept quiet by graft and plunder; those whom he considered troublesome he killed—about 2,000 out of a total population of some 300,000. In the words of Prof. Jacob H. Hollander, of Johns Hopkins, the reorganizer of Dominican finance under the recent régime:

The country was at peace; but it was the hush of a merciless terrorism, not the quiet of civil government. The seeming well-being which prevailed was attained by a bartering of resources of the country in prodigal concessions, and by discounting the future in reckless debt accumulations.

In the year 1899 Heureaux was assassinated, and, as Dr. Hollander well says, "With Heureaux's assassination came the deluge; the next six years constituted a climax, even in the history of Latin-American politics." There succeeded a reign of terror in the Republic which is comparable only to that which has prevailed in Mexico since the abdication of President Diaz. Chieftain after chieftain attempted to secure and to hold the presidency, and the country groaned under the hopeless and lawless conditions which resulted.

In the words of T. Lothrop Stoddard, writing in the *American Review of Reviews* last June, from whom I have gleaned some of the foregoing facts:

Debasement as it had been to the Dominicans themselves, the 17 years' tyranny of Heureaux had given the outer world a vital interest in the country's future. Attracted by the political quiet imposed by Heureaux's rule, vast amounts of foreign capital had begun the development of the Republic's marvelous resources, while the dictator's lavish foreign loans had imposed heavy interest responsibilities. Accordingly, the carnival of riot and destruction following Heureaux's death had not long continued before the great powers were besieged with appeals from fugitive foreign planters, ruined concessionaires, and defrauded bondholders. And by the year 1904 it became perfectly clear that whatever the United States might fail to do to protect its injured citizens, the European powers were determined to see that their subjects obtained redress. The American Government was plainly told that at least two great European powers were determined on intervention in Santo Domingo if something were not speedily done.

Neither the temper of the United States nor of President Roosevelt would perhaps willingly have brooked intervention by any foreign power. Accordingly in January, 1905, the protocol of an agreement was drawn up between the United States and the Dominican Governments providing that the United States should adjust the Dominican debt and administer the customs for the benefit of creditors. This protocol failing of ratification by the Senate, President Roosevelt made an interim agreement with the then President of Santo Domingo, Morales, providing for the collection of the Dominican customs by persons designated by him, 55 per cent of the proceeds to be deposited in the United States for the benefit of creditors. The various factions in the island were given plainly to understand that they would not be permitted to loot the customhouses in their former manner. This announcement cut the backbone out of the revolution. The nearest customhouse was always the goal of every insurgent "general," and with this possibility removed the lust of conflict quickly cooled.

After two years' operation the success of the Roosevelt-Morales interim agreement became so clear that the Senate consented to ratify a convention for American administration of Dominican customs if the original idea of an American adjustment of the Dominican debt were abandoned. Accordingly, the American receivership of the Republic's customs was formally ratified and assured legal permanence by the American-Dominican convention of 1907, a copy of which I shall append as part of my remarks.

Prior to 1914 but nine years had passed since the Roosevelt-Morales agreement ushered in the new régime; yet those nine years had brought an increase in prosperity and civilization almost unbelievable to those unaware of the marvelous natural wealth of Santo Domingo. Plantations had sprung up on all sides. Railroad extension continually brought new areas under development. Foreign capital poured in freely and the mass of the population enjoyed a prosperity and security never before known. The total customs collections for the fiscal year 1912-13 exceeded \$4,000,000, and the terms of the debt service were met with ease. The total foreign trade had grown from less than \$10,000,000 in 1905 to over \$20,000,000 in 1912, and about the same in 1913. Imports had increased from \$3,000,000 to \$9,000,000 during this period, and exports from \$7,000,000 to \$12,000,000. The share of the United States in the exports of Santo Domingo actually exceeded 70 per cent in one year and averaged close to 60 per cent; of the imports of Santo Domingo the United States was in recent years furnishing well over 60 per cent. The country thus was flourishing, and on the commercial side its friendship was proving financially profitable as well as internationally highly desirable.

I can not take the time to discuss at length the bearing which the foregoing recital has upon a true appreciation of the Monroe doctrine. Prof. Hiram Bingham, in his work upon the Monroe doctrine, says:

Another one of the "fruits" which has not escaped the attention of our neighbors in South America is our intervention in Santo Domingo. . . . There has been an occasional revolution since we took control of the customhouses, but the financial condition of the island is certainly better than it was. Thus we may seem to have been justified in our course, but the fact remains that, although our intervention may have been an excellent thing for the people of Santo Domingo, it has undoubtedly interfered with their right to do as they please with their own money, and has acted as a sinister warning to other Latin-American States as to what they may expect of us if they fail to pay their debts.

It may be admitted that the "international policeman" idea of Prof. Bingham may have disquieting possibilities in the future; at the same time it will be generally recognized that at the end of the Taft administration material conditions in the island had vastly improved. Mr. Stoddard, whom I have already quoted, for example, says:

No page of our foreign policy is brighter than the story of our recent relations with that little State.

Of course, the character of the people had not been wholly changed, and there were during the nine years prior to 1914

ominous warnings that the old spirit of anarchy was still smoldering. In 1911 President Caceres, who had succeeded Morales, was assassinated, and a political upheaval was narrowly averted. In the summer of 1912 open revolution broke out and the insurgents ventured to seize the customhouses in the territory under their control. But President Taft soon showed that he would tolerate no return to the old dispensation, and 750 marines quickly ousted the revolutionists and restored American control.

I have detailed at this length the conditions prior to the advent of the Wilson administration to show the extreme delicacy and importance of the situation presented. Whatever one may think of the application of the Monroe doctrine to the state of facts, we have seen that tremendous prosperity to the people of the island and large increased foreign trade for ourselves had resulted from the step. We were apparently committed to continue in the island, and equally apparently the most careful and adroit management on the part of the United States was necessary to guide into peaceful channels the restless spirits of the people of the Republic.

Realizing the extremely delicate state of affairs, President Taft had in 1911 sent as minister to the Dominican Republic Mr. William W. Russell. Mr. Russell was born in Washington, D. C., in 1859. He was educated at the United States Naval Academy; was civil engineer and served on several surveys in South America, Mexico, and the United States; was lieutenant on the cruiser *America* when that vessel was delivered to the Brazilian authorities; was appointed secretary of the legation at Caracas November 15, 1895—his first purely diplomatic post thus having been the gift of a Democratic President; was appointed secretary of the legation at Panama City February 5, 1904; was appointed minister to Colombia in 1904, and minister to Venezuela in 1905; served as commissioner to the international exposition in Quito, Ecuador, in 1908-9; was appointed minister resident and consul general to the Dominican Republic in 1910, and was made minister, as I have previously stated, in 1911.

In other words, Mr. Russell was a thoroughly trained diplomat who had spent upward of 20 years in various capacities in Latin America. It is doubtful, perhaps, if he had any strong partisan affiliations, but presumably, from the fact that he was originally appointed by President Cleveland, he was a Democrat. He had served some three years in Santo Domingo with marked distinction and was from every point of view abundantly equipped to guide our diplomatic course through a very ticklish channel.

Yet he was displaced just as soon as Secretary Bryan got around to it. And by whom? By a trained diplomat? Hardly, with Mr. Bryan the appointing officer. The selection was James M. Sullivan, a criminal lawyer of New York. The fact that he was the defender of "Bald Jack" Rose seems hardly a sufficient reason for his selection, even from the Bryan point of view; therefore the fact that he was an indefatigable organizer of Democratic clubs in the campaign of 1912 must, beyond peradventure, have been the persuasive circumstance in the appointment. Mr. Sullivan was confirmed by the Senate August 12, 1913, and shortly thereafter went to his post. There were ugly rumors almost at the outset as to the reasons underlying his appointment and as to certain connections of his which were likely to make his presence in the island Republic highly undesirable.

For example, writing in the *North American Review* for February, 1914, that eminent Democrat, Col. George Harvey, refers to the appointment in these terms:

His cousin is a contractor interested in railroad concessions in Santo Domingo.

I have previously pointed out how crushed to earth Santo Domingo had been for years prior to 1905 by domestic and foreign graft, by outrageous concessions, and by profligate and illegitimate contracts. Even if we could not, perhaps, have expected from Mr. Bryan a minister with any affirmative qualifications for the post, it did not seem unreasonable to expect, especially in view of the great delicacy of conditions there prevailing, that he would not appoint a man so manifestly unfit from every point of view to represent the United States Government.

A brief digression is here necessary. The office of general receiver of Dominican customs is a presidential appointment. William E. Pulliam, a Democrat, was receiver general in the early part of the Wilson administration. On June 16, 1913, Walker W. Vick, of Rutherford, N. J., was appointed to succeed Mr. Pulliam. Who's Who for 1914-15 tells us that Mr. Vick was "manager general headquarters Woodrow Wilson, at New York, pre-convention campaign, 1912; assistant secretary of the Democratic National Committee, 1912, and organized New

York Headquarters; secretary Wilson inaugural committee; Democrat; member Democratic Club at Rutherford, N. J., and of Bergen County Democratic Club of Hackensack, N. J." At all events, there seems no doubt of Mr. Vick's democracy or Woodrow Wilsonism; subsequent events have proved that he also had a backbone.

Shortly after Minister Sullivan's arrival at Santo Domingo, the internal conditions in the island became greatly disturbed and continued to become more and more chaotic as the months passed.

In December, 1913, when the Dominican elections occurred, the Wilson administration took the extraordinary step of sending over a horde of Americans to "supervise" the elections. Current Opinion for January, 1914, says:

The dispatch to Santo Domingo last month, in spite of the protest of that Government, of three officials connected with our State Department, and about 300 other Americans employed in the public service of Porto Rico, to observe and report on the elections, was an application of this new policy regarding constitutional governments (i. e., not to deal with or to countenance anything else). It was explained by Secretary Bryan, in a letter to Minister Sullivan, as follows:

"Please say to President Bordas that the President has planned to send a number of Americans to visit the principal polling places on election day, not as a 'commission' for which this Government asks any official recognition, but only as individuals, to lend moral support by their presence to the efforts which President Bordas has so fully pledged himself to make that the elections shall be free and uninfluenced in every respect, and in order that, if any questions should arise as to good faith of anyone concerned, undeniably impartial witnesses may be available to bear testimony as to exactly what happened."

I wonder if the intolerable smugness of this letter deceived even the most ignorant Dominican? We had no protectorate over the island or the Republic; we had no possible concern with its elections. This letter recognizes these circumstances and yet these Americans "visit" the polling places merely as "individuals to lend moral support by their presence" and to furnish "undeniably impartial" testimony in case of need. The phrasing of Mr. Bryan's letter would make it equally proper to send men to "supervise" British, French, or Italian elections. Perhaps the action was wise in this case, in spite of the strongly voiced opposition of the Republic itself; in spite of the clear departure from the Monroe doctrine as usually understood. But let us at least be candid in what we do and not hopelessly hypocritical.

Mr. Sullivan, as we have seen, had a troubled year in Santo Domingo. On June 9, 1914, Mr. Vick, after nearly a year of strife with Minister Sullivan, tendered his resignation, and immediately returned to the United States to bring to the attention of the Wilson administration just what manner of man our representative was.

A Washington dispatch, dated July 7, 1914, stated:

James M. Sullivan, United States Minister to Santo Domingo, is returning to Washington from his post, whence he sailed for New York on July 2. Mr. Sullivan has been in Santo Domingo nearly a year, during which time conditions in that Republic have been in constant turmoil, and at the present time a state of war prevails in the north, requiring the presence of American warships. Mr. Sullivan has been severely criticized because of his conduct of the affairs of his office, and doubt was expressed by many here that he will return to his post after he reaches this country.

It was only a few days ago that Walker Vick resigned the directorship of customs in Santo Domingo. It is understood here that friction between Vick and Sullivan was the real cause of Mr. Vick's resignation.

As illustrating the condition in the island about the same time and as showing conclusively how within a year a comparatively peaceful and orderly community had gone back to the dark age of anarchy and revolution, it may be worth while to append at this point a brief dispatch from Washington, dated July 15, 1914:

TO TAKE HAND IN DOMINICAN AFFAIRS—TRANSPORT "HANCOCK," CARRYING MARINES AND BLUEJACKETS, AND GUNBOAT SENT TO GUANTANAMO.

WASHINGTON, July 14, 1914.

With the transport *Hancock* speeding through the Gulf of Mexico, carrying marines and bluejackets from Vera Cruz toward Guantánamo, Cuba, as the first move in a demonstration to warn Haiti and San Domingo that they must put their Governments in order, it was intimated in official circles to-day that if actual intervention became necessary the United States might establish a financial trusteeship in Haiti and insist upon enlarging the authority it now exercises in the collection of Dominican customs.

Any radical change, it was said, in the administration policy toward the island Governments would be aimed to establish a fair system of internal and external taxation, with guarantees for the proper expenditures of collections. American administrators of the Dominican customs have complained that their present powers are too limited.

Several European powers have made representations to the American State Department concerning large financial interests that have suffered from continuance of revolutionary chaos in the little Republics. Financial affairs of both Governments, it is known, are in a state very unsatisfactory to foreign creditors. San Domingo's customs revenues have been so curtailed that it is said to be doubtful whether they will suffice to meet regular charges on account of the consolidated foreign debt, for which they are pledged. Conditions in Haiti are not much better.

Last fall, in response to the determined campaign by Mr. Vick for an investigation of Minister Sullivan's career, the State Department made a somewhat abortive investigation of Dominican affairs, with especial reference to the participation therein of Mr. Sullivan. This did not satisfy Mr. Vick, and he finally succeeded last December in having former Mayor Phelan, of San Francisco, Democratic Senator elect from California and a man of high distinction and ability, designated to conduct a real inquiry into the career in Santo Domingo of Minister Sullivan. The newspapers have stated that this action was taken by President Wilson "over Secretary Bryan's head." The dispatches, dated December 10 last, stated:

President Wilson has ordered an investigation into charges that James M. Sullivan, of New York, now minister to the Dominican Republic, had been guilty of misconduct in office, mainly through alleged use of influence to obtain contracts from the Dominican Government for a relative and friends and by having Dominican revenue collections transferred to a bank in Santo Domingo city which New York financial interests friendly to Mr. Sullivan were said to control.

The investigation was conducted for some two weeks in New York during January last, then for a few days here in Washington, and it is understood that Mr. Phelan has within a few days sailed for Santo Domingo for a thorough search into the history of Mr. Sullivan's régime there. Mr. Phelan will doubtless ultimately make a full report to the President, though whether or not this report will be made available to the public is not yet known. President Wilson is certainly to be commended for his vigorous, though somewhat tardy, action along this line and for the designation of a man of the parts of Mr. Phelan.

While I have nothing but the highest respect and regard for Senator Phelan, both as a man and as a public servant, it must not be forgotten that he is a staunch Democrat and that in his recent successful campaign for his seat in the Senate he relied mightily upon the written indorsements of President Wilson and Secretary Bryan. I am sure he will intend to be absolutely fair, but after all his predisposition must necessarily be to stand by and to uphold the administration and its appointees. Under these circumstances the investigation can hardly be deemed an impartial one. Indeed, it can hardly be called, in any true sense, an investigation at all.

How fundamentally different is this inquiry from one conducted by a bipartisan congressional select committee. Take, for example, the investigation conducted in 1910 by a Republican Congress of a Republican Cabinet officer. The special committee consisted of 12 Members, 6 from the Senate and 6 from the House. Four from each branch were Republicans and two were Democrats. The minority was allowed to designate its own representatives on that committee.

The investigation of such a committee, whatever the majority might report, was absolutely certain to bring to light every material fact upon which the public might base an intelligent opinion. How different is the present situation. The "commission" of inquiry consists of one member; that member is a staunch Democrat; he has no power to subpoena witnesses and he has the power—even though not the inclination, perhaps—to bring out what testimony he wishes and to suppress what he deems best. His finding obviously can not under the circumstances carry with it the weight which it should.

Much of the testimony, as reported in the newspapers, has dealt with the alleged corrupt negotiations of Mr. Sullivan with the various interests who were seeking to exploit the poor little Republic for their own welfare. A great deal of the testimony is exceedingly unsavory and certainly indicates a condition, of which Mr. Sullivan had knowledge, to be deplored by every right-thinking American. The testimony upon this head, however, is so extensive and so complex that it seems preferable not to attempt to abstract it at this time for fear that, unwittingly, some injustice might be done Mr. Sullivan or his associates. There are certain aspects of the testimony, however, to which reference may properly and perhaps profitably be made at this time.

KNOWLEDGE THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAD AS TO WHAT WAS GOING ON.

It should be remembered, as before stated, that both Mr. Vick and Mr. Pulliam, whom I shall quote principally, are Democrats and prima facie friendly to the administration and its policies. Mr. Vick was the personal selection of Secretary of War Garrison for the post at the island. In an interview with Mr. Garrison which appeared in the course of the hearings in New York last month, the *New York World* of Saturday, January 16, 1915, reports him as follows:

I am responsible for the appointment of collector of customs. I appointed Mr. Vick, and I accept the responsibility for his appointment. I know nothing about the other appointments, and I will not discuss the case any further.

Mr. Vick repeatedly tendered his resignation after the administration at Washington refused to act on the information sent by him to the War Department regarding certain doubtful episodes in Santo Domingo. Finally, as Mr. Vick refused to be longer responsible for conditions there, his resignation was accepted by President Wilson in terms flattering to Mr. Vick's integrity and ability. This is what the returned official had to say of the unsavory conditions in the island:

Before resigning my office I exhausted every resource at my command, both as an official and as an individual, first to induce, later to compel, a competent and impartial investigation of the appointment of Minister Sullivan and his official acts. I felt then and I believe now that the honor of the American Government and of the Democratic administration is involved. I was advised repeatedly to keep my own skirts clean and to ignore the conditions surrounding me—a situation that I could not close my eyes to and maintain my self-respect. Such an attitude is not my ideal of citizenship nor of public service. I know, too, that it is not the ideal of President Wilson, and I have never faltered in my faith that if ever the truth about Santo Domingo could be placed directly in his hands there would be prompt and righteous action.

It should be remembered that Mr. Vick resigned his office about the first of June last and that Mr. Sullivan is still minister to Santo Domingo.

As stated in the Boston Advertiser of December 9 last:

The air of sanctity which hangs around the office of the Secretary of State at Washington has been disturbed by certain meddlesome persons who will not be hushed up and who seem to grow more insistent the longer Mr. Bryan tries to ignore them.

The charge has been made to Secretary Bryan repeatedly (and with the offer of proofs to be examined by him whenever he is willing to make the investigation) that interests which have never appeared publicly in the matter have been at work to use the influence of the United States to get for themselves a number of concessions in Santo Domingo. We do not know how much of truth there may be in these charges. There have been some pretty strong accusations made, and the investigation made by Congress this winter may serve to show how much of all this case can be proven by incontestable evidence. But at least the charges are made by Democrats against Democrats, so that it can hardly be claimed that the affair has any partisan tinge.

The whole history of affairs in Santo Domingo since the present American minister, James M. Sullivan, took charge there, presents evidence of more or less influence by Tammany men upon the business affairs of the Republic. Just how far the events were subject to the influence of Minister Sullivan will be one of the things which Congress must be expected to determine. Mr. Sullivan, as the former attorney for the notorious "Jack" Rose, in the Rosenthal affair, was probably pretty well acquainted with the type of Americans who followed him to Santo Domingo City, and who showed such activity in attempting to influence the course of financial decisions, after American influence became predominant there.

A few weeks ago word came from Washington that the State Department had asked some prominent Americans to conduct a rigid inquiry into the conduct of Minister Sullivan and his general policies in Santo Domingo, and that the verdict of these men had fully exonerated the American minister. This was accepted by the American public as satisfactory, and we had supposed that the whole case had been dropped. The surprising feature now develops that the men who were publicly named as investigators emphatically deny that they served in any such capacity. They declare that Secretary Bryan must have been misled by somebody, and they insist that they are as ignorant of the alleged "investigation" as anybody else could be. They declare that they made no report on the case for the very good reason that they were never asked to do so, and never took any part in the reported "inquiry."

It is to be noted that since the attempt of Secretary Bryan to use the whitewash pail and brush in this case, rumors have been flying thick and fast at Washington, to the effect that Mr. Bryan is soon to leave the Cabinet. Whether the two developments have been wholly independent, or whether there may be some connection between them, we do not profess to know. But it is at least certain that Mr. Vick's emphatic statements have caused a decided flutter at Washington. The fact that Mr. Vick stands so close to W. F. McCombs, President Wilson's most influential adviser, lends further weight to the gravity of the proposed investigation. Altogether, the general impression that the Santo Domingo charges may carry a large amount of concealed political dynamite may be easily understood under such circumstances.

Former Receiver Pulliam testified that after his removal he had warned Assistant Secretary of State Osborne and Gen. McIntyre, head of the Bureau of Insular Affairs of the War Department. "That is what incenses me so much," said Mr. Pulliam; "to know that the administration would lend its exclusive ears to one particular faction only in Santo Domingo politics." Pulliam further testified that he had specifically warned Mr. Osborne in July, 1913: "Under no circumstances have anything to do with the Banco Nacional crowd," and had explained the character of the institution to him and that it was seeking to exploit Dominican finances.

I was surprised and incensed [said Mr. Pulliam] that such a coterie got to Bryan's ears. I was sorry to see the receivership of customs made the subject of political exploitation. I recalled the instructions which Secretary Root gave me when he said that those funds should be administered as a sacred trust. For eight years the receivership had been operated without any trouble and the difficulties that later arose were unquestionably caused by Sullivan's transferring the funds to the Banco Nacional. That was what they wanted. They had no funds. They wanted to establish credit for themselves. Why, nobody would accept their notes of issue except as handbills on the street. The bank was a joke.

James L. Bryne, of Boston, a construction engineer, testified to a conversation which he had had with the Secretary of State; that he had told Mr. Bryan that the minister's cousin, Timothy J. Sullivan, had stated to him that the minister had

arranged that the Banco Nacional should get Government contracts, and that he—Timothy J. Sullivan—was down in Santo Domingo to manage the construction work and to see that Minister Sullivan got his "bit." Continuing, he said:

The American people, the President of the United States, and the Democratic Party have been discredited and dishonored in Santo Domingo by the conduct of Minister Sullivan. I did everything I could to get Mr. Bryan to take the matter up.

MR. SULLIVAN'S DIPLOMATIC METHODS.

Mr. Vick in the course of the examination was asked if he knew of an official call paid by the Italian minister and by the British chargé d'affaires upon Mr. Sullivan. He replied:

I know from a gentleman who was present and whose name I can not reveal publicly that these officials called upon Mr. Sullivan and that when he received them he wore only trousers and an undershirt open at the throat, with his suspenders dangling behind him. I am told he greeted the diplomats as "old sports" and that they were so indignant that they left and refused to call upon him again.

Mr. Vick further testified that the affair became the subject of much unfavorable comment in official and business circles.

Charles A. Butlin, former director general of telegraph and wireless service in Santo Domingo, testified that Mr. Sullivan—

Would not even take off his hat when the members of the Dominican cabinet called upon him, and it was common report that on one occasion he received the Italian Minister, Massignia, and another diplomat, in his undershirt, with his suspenders hanging down.

It is stated elsewhere in the testimony that the diplomatic call above referred to was made during the hours customary for such diplomatic formalities, and Sullivan could not justly plead that he was taken unawares. The story was told to Mr. Vick by an eyewitness.

Mr. Butlin also told of Sullivan generally affronting the sensibilities of the Dominicans, who are an extremely ceremonious and ceremonial people, by his boorish manners.

An interesting side light to indicate the point of view of an American citizen upon Mr. Sullivan's methods was furnished by Commissioner Phelan.

"When I was mayor of San Francisco," said Mr. Phelan, "I paid an official call upon the Lord Mayor of London. It seems there was moving or house cleaning going on, and his lordship came downstairs and greeted me in his shirt sleeves. I had supposed that the lord mayoralty consisted mostly of clothes. Later the lord mayor invited me to a dinner, which I declined to attend because I considered his reception of me as an official caller in his shirt sleeves was an insult."

HOW WAS MR. SULLIVAN REGARDED IN SANTO DOMINGO?

Perhaps this question answers itself. Mr. Vick was asked by Commissioner Phelan:

Q. Is Mr. Sullivan popular in Santo Domingo?

A. Hardly; I should say not.

Q. Was he ever fired at?

A. With bricks, not bullets. He has been hissed and hooted when driving, and on one occasion the lamps of his carriage were smashed by a mob. There is ample testimony that he frequently went driving with a guard of Government troops.

John L. Mann, former American director of public works in Santo Domingo, testified that he had informed the State Department that Mr. Sullivan had greatly offended the Dominicans and that he made it impossible for any American to walk the streets without being subject to insults. Mr. Mann also testified that Sullivan's personal habits were offensive to any Spanish-American who regards observance of the forms of etiquette as important.

Mr. Semple testified that last year he went to Mr. Bryan and begged him not to return Sullivan to his post. He read to Secretary Bryan a telegram from Paul Fuller—whom President Wilson sent to Mexico as his trusted agent—to the same effect. Testifying further, he said:

It is the consensus in Santo Domingo among Americans, Dominicans, Germans, and other foreign merchants that Minister Sullivan is a detriment to American business; that his connection with the Bordas government—whatever it may have been—and his relations with the Banco Nacional and his open association with its president make it impossible for him to serve American interests.

Mr. Vick on another occasion testified that Sullivan was generally credited with being responsible for the Dominican revolution of 1914 because he upheld the Bordas government against the Legalistas.

I do not wish it to be thought that I regard it as a serious indictment of Mr. Sullivan that he was careless in his dress, manners, or speech; we all know many men of the highest character and standing in the community who are not over-scrupulous in these ways. But, as one of the witnesses testified, the Dominicans are a "polite" people; like most Latin-Americans they think a great deal of the forms of life and are often-times greatly influenced in their estimate of a man by his personal methods of speech and dress. If Mr. Sullivan had been in the island as an individual, it would not have been of great consequence how he comported himself. But he was in the island

as the official representative of the people of the United States. It was incumbent upon him, if he could honorably do so, to demean himself so as to merit and obtain the approval of the people among whom he was to live. Conduct of this kind was what they had been, doubtless, accustomed to from experience with Minister Russell and his predecessors and it was what they felt they had a right to expect of Mr. Sullivan. They were bitterly disappointed in him and showed their resentment in reprehensible but characteristic ways. Mr. Sullivan's usefulness as a diplomat was gone from the moment when the people began to hate him. He could no longer serve his country efficiently. We all know the importance of the personal side of our diplomatic service; we all know that Mr. Herrick and Mr. Gerard and Mr. Page have been of supremest usefulness in the anxious six months just passed because they were respected, admired, and beloved by the people to whom they were accredited. We all know perfectly well, too, that after hostility succeeds friendship, usefulness disappears. And usefulness in this connection means not merely an establishment and maintenance of friendship, but an increase in volume of trade which can be measured in dollars and cents. Mr. Sullivan was tried in the balance and found wanting in this exceedingly material way, and it is no necessary imputation upon his character or intentions that such is the case.

Nor do I mean to be captious in criticizing the State Department for the way the Sullivan ministry turned out. The best of men go wrong sometimes and the State Department can not be an insurer of the tact and skillfulness of a given representative in a difficult mission. My criticism of the State Department is, first, in sending to this delicate post a man whose training and experience had been such as manifestly to make it impossible, or at all events exceedingly unlikely, that he would wisely or successfully fit into the general scheme of things in the island; and second, in closing its ears to the repeated and sinister reports which we have seen were continually being brought to the attention of Mr. Bryan and his subordinates. I do not then blame the department because Mr. Sullivan turned out badly, because his régime in Santo Domingo has set back the United States there more than can well be measured; I blame it because at the outset it was manifest to any fair-minded man that Mr. Sullivan was not a judicious choice, and because, as the months passed, in spite of repeated warnings from authentic and dependable sources of information, no attempt was made to bring to an end his wretched official career.

Now we come naturally to the famous letter written by Secretary of State Bryan to Mr. Vick at Santo Domingo, dated August 20, 1913. Our memories are still charged with the events of that month of August, 1913. The Mexican situation was highly critical at that moment and the President was even then preparing his message to Congress, which he read on the 27th of August. The exigency was indeed such as to strain the resources of the State Department and of the Secretary of State. Yet just at this time, when one would have supposed him to be immersed in the grave questions arising out of the Mexican trouble, we find Mr. Bryan writing the following letter to Mr. Vick:

WALKER W. VICK,
Receiver of Customs, Santo Domingo City.

MY DEAR MR. VICK: Now that you have arrived and are acquainting yourself with the situation, can you let me know what positions you have to reward deserving Democrats? Whenever you desire suggestions from me in regard to a man for any place down there, call on me.

You have had enough experience in politics to know how valuable workers are when the campaign is on and how difficult it is to find suitable rewards for the deserving. I do not know to what extent a knowledge of the Spanish language is necessary for employees. Let me know what is requisite, together with the salary and when appointments are likely to be made.

Sullivan will be down before long, and you and he together ought to be able to bring about such reforms as may be necessary there, and you will find Sullivan a strong, courageous, and reliable fellow. The more I have seen of him the better satisfied I am that he will fit into the place there and do what is necessary to be done.

Very truly, yours,

W. J. BRYAN.

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 20, 1913.

Note the language—

Positions to reward deserving Democrats; find suitable rewards for all the deserving.

Not a thought or a suggestion of experience or ability or character or Americanism—just a brazen attempt to find any kind of a job for the Bryan hangers-on. Interpreted in the light of Mr. Bryan's point of view, it is easy to understand the meaning of his suggestion in the letter that he is satisfied that Minister Sullivan will "do what is necessary to be done." This phrasing makes still clearer—if, indeed, any evidence were needed—the motives behind Mr. Bryan's selection of Sullivan and the entire absence of any belief on his part that capacity and character were necessary elements in a minister to a foreign nation. It

must be remembered that Mr. Bryan, in penning this letter, was writing to a staunch Democratic campaigner, to a man who he believed shared his own more or less high ideals of what constitutes true public service.

Contrast this letter, with its revealing frankness, with the high-sounding and sonorous interview which, as we have seen, Mr. Bryan caused to be circulated through Latin America:

It may take some time to convince all of the people of Latin America of this Nation's disinterested friendship.

Indeed it may.

They have sometimes been made the victims of commercial greed; they sometimes have suffered by exploitation by concessionaires without compensation, and are therefore naturally suspicious, but these suspicions can be overcome and will be overcome.

Can Mr. Bryan think in his heart, or even have the effrontery to say, that he, in the Santo Domingo incident, was practicing what he preaches? Can any instance be found in our recent history of more complete and thorough hypocrisy? Let us call the whole story "Pecksniff Up to Date."

Let us see what these jobs were which Mr. Bryan sought for "deserving Democrats." Here is the list as furnished him by Mr. Vick:

	Yearly salary.
Deputy receiver general of customs.....	\$6,000
Secretary to the receivership; minimum, \$1,800; maximum.....	2,400
Chief statistician.....	2,200
Assistant auditor; minimum, \$1,800; maximum.....	2,200
Record clerk; minimum, \$1,600; maximum.....	1,920
Superintendent of Revenue-Cutter Service.....	2,200
Executive clerk.....	1,500
Spanish stenographer and translator.....	1,800
Five special inspectors; total salaries, minimum, \$9,000; maximum.....	12,000
Customs collector.....	2,200
Total.....	34,420

Mr. Vick testified that Secretary Bryan, on the recommendation of Boaz Long, until lately chief of the Division of Latin-American Affairs in the Department of State, had appointed Charles M. Johnston, of Indianapolis, financial expert for the Republic.

Bryan told me that Johnston would get \$8,000 a year and expenses—

Said Mr. Vick.

Johnston was a flour salesman in Mexico, and as far as I know has never had any experience that will qualify him for the job. He's been down there six months and hasn't done a thing yet. Johnston is supposed to be a sort of a comptroller, a new office picked out of the skies.

When Secretary Bryan was told that a copy of his Vick letter was made public he made this statement:

I am glad to have the public know that I appreciate the services of those who work in politics and feel an interest in seeing them rewarded. I think these are the only charges that can be based on that letter, and as Mr. Vick received his appointment as a reward for political work, I thought he was a good man to address in expressing my opinion on the subject.

The New York World reporter states that when the above statement was read to Mr. Bryan for verification, he appeared to be greatly pleased with it.

He gave the impression that he believed some of his jobless followers of former years might understand that he was still looking for places where he could put them on a regular pay roll.

Another account states:

The Secretary of State seemed to regard the entire matter as a huge joke. The suggestion that the State Department had been made, since his entrance into office, a sort of employment bureau for the faithful machine politicians from various quarters of the United States, did not interest the Secretary in the least. He listened to the further suggestion that the offices parceled out in Santo Domingo were in no sense political plums, in view of the fact that the salaries were paid, not out of the United States Treasury, but from the Dominican treasury, without comment.

It is apparent that a sense of the fitness of things can not be injected into the Secretary of State by any methods now known to civilization.

Contrast this attitude with that of the previous history of the receivership. Mr. Pulliam, who had held the office of receiver of customs for six years prior to the incumbency of Mr. Vick, testified that he never had a demand or even a suggestion offered by the Department of State during the Republican régime that he should find places for "deserving Republicans." He said that politics had never entered into the receiver's office until the advent of the Bryan-Sullivan régime. "I always remembered the instructions given me by ELIHU ROOT, Secretary of State, when I was appointed, that the funds of the receivership were a sacred Government trust and should be guarded and administered with a knowledge of that fact." As I have previously stated, it is said in the newspaper accounts of the hearings that Mr. Pulliam is himself a Democrat.

In view of the extremely uneasy temper of the inhabitants of Santo Domingo; in view of the fact that our relationship to that island was that of a fiduciary and a guardian; in view of

the fact that Latin America was watching closely our conduct there; in view of the fact that United States partisan politics had always been rigidly excluded from the island; in view of repeated and enlightened utterances upon disinterested friendship for Latin America made by the "Apostle of (gold) Peace," it would seem as if the United States had a right and a duty to ask the writer of the Vick letter to indite another epistle—a letter of resignation as Secretary of State. [Applause.]

It is a comfort to know that the newspapers and magazines of the country have given the incident the treatment which it deserves. At the end of these remarks, I shall append some additional comments, mostly from newspapers inclined to be friendly to the present administration. The Literary Digest for January 30, last, sums up the situation thus:

The impression made upon the independent press may be gathered from the Springfield Republican's declaration that Mr. Bryan's utterances "deeply alarm as well as affront the best citizenship of the land," the New York Evening Post's characterization of his letter as "probably the most disgraceful thing ever written by any American Secretary of State," and the New York Globe's sweeping assertion that "in our whole history there has not been such an exhibition of indecency by a man in high office." Several independent papers hint that Mr. Bryan should now pen another letter containing his resignation. Mr. Bryan is revealed to the country, according to the New York Tribune (Rep.), as "a Secretary of State without sensitiveness and without shame." But the Democratic New York World is hardly less severe. Mr. Bryan, it says, "is a good man, an amiable man, and a well-meaning man, but he has no common sense and no appreciation of the dignity of his office." "Even Charles F. Murphy," declares the World, "would have hesitated to send that kind of a letter to a subordinate Tammany official. He would have regarded it as too raw," and the World is convinced that "by his folly and foolishness, Mr. Bryan has given the Republicans legitimate issue that the country will not hear the last of for many a day." Similarly, the Charleston News and Courier (Dem.) admits that "the letter to Vick will be used for all its worth, and that it will alienate thousands who have been looking to the Democracy as the party of progress."

The National Civil Service Reform League, at its annual mid-winter meeting held in New York on the 7th of this month, after thoroughly discussing the Bryan-Vick letter, adopted the following resolution:

The National Civil Service Reform League profoundly regrets that the Secretary of State appears to have suggested and advocated and later publicly justified the use of the customs service of Santo Domingo, constituting a national trust for the benefit of another American Republic and its creditors, to reward partisan services in our domestic politics.

The National Civil Service Reform League, by its governing body, declares this course plainly inconsistent, not only with fidelity to the principles of the merit system and with the purpose avowed in the Democratic national platform of 1912, to make "merit and ability the standard of appointment and promotion rather than service to a political party," but with ordinary good faith toward the Dominican Republic and its creditors. It hereby publicly expresses its earnest hope that the President will promptly take such effective action as may prevent the practical application of a policy so generally and justly condemned.

Seriously, why does Mr. Bryan continue on as Secretary of State? It must be inconvenient for him to adjust his occasional visits to the State Department so as not to interfere with his speaking engagements elsewhere; and, furthermore, the necessity which he is under in Washington of occasionally speaking without compensation must, in accordance with familiar economic laws, somewhat reduce the numbers of those who will later pay to hear him lecture. A newspaper account, dated November 30, 1914, analyzed the amount of time which the Secretary has been able to devote to the foreign affairs of the Government during the previous six weeks—six weeks that were pregnant with sinister possibilities that the United States might be involved in the European war. Perhaps the article is worth reproducing in full:

BRYAN ON THE JOB 10 DAYS OUT OF 46.

WASHINGTON, November 30, 1914.

Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan devoted just 10 days of his time to the foreign affairs of the Government, over which his department has control, from October 14 to November 28, inclusive.

Mr. Bryan passed Friday in Washington, on his way from his estate in Florida to Ann Arbor, Mich., where he addressed the students of the University of Michigan Saturday evening.

From October 14 to November 10 Bryan was making political speeches in various parts of the country.

From November 10 until November 17 he was at the State Department.

Proceeding to his Florida estate on the latter date, he remained there until November 24.

Returning to Washington on November 24, he put in two days (Thanksgiving being a holiday and therefore not counting) at the State Department. On Friday night he closed his desk and entrained for Ann Arbor. He is scheduled to return on Tuesday next for a short stay.

TIME TO UNEARTH A JOB.

The Secretary of State's last act before leaving Washington for his recent sojourn in Florida was to unearth a \$5,000 job—that as counsel for the Canadian Boundary Commission—and to confer it upon Manton M. Wyvel, his private secretary. The duties of this office, which is catalogued in the "lame duck" class, are purely nominal; the wage is good.

Until Mr. Bryan's departure for Florida a considerable portion of his time each day has been given to the reception of political friends and to tireless efforts to land them in jobs.

On the day before he turned over the affairs of the State Department to Assistants Lansing and Adee an American engaged in business in South America was compelled to wait for more than two hours while Mr. Bryan discussed patronage with political retainers. The business man's description illuminates a scene that has been typical in the State Department since Mr. Bryan became the head of it. It was:

"It was really amusing to me, because I had come from New York on a matter of diplomatic purport. As I sat waiting for the Secretary I procured a view of how business is not done in the State Department. Five men of the Bryan type held the attention of the head of the Foreign Department. I was by force of proximity compelled to hear fragments of the conversation. From what I heard I gleaned that the callers had been 'friends' since '96. Each of the callers was looking for a job.

GLAD TO SEE THEM.

"The Secretary of State was manifestly glad to see them. He blushed like a school girl at the words of praise showered upon him. He beamed appreciatively upon hearing assurances of future indulgence of such political ambitions as he may desire to exploit. All of the callers departed with manifest satisfaction over their prospects for being stacked up against the national pay roll."

As a New York headline facetiously phrased it the other day—just before Thanksgiving, in fact—"Secretary Bryan returns to Washington for the holidays."

The most recent development in the Santo Domingo situation of which I have knowledge is recited in a press dispatch from Santo Domingo, dated January 22, 1915, and reads as follows:

SANTO DOMINGO, January 22.

A sensation has been caused here by the discovery of defalcations in the funds of the department of public works, amounting to many thousand dollars. The public works of the Dominican Republic are expended under supervision of the United States Government in its capacity as trustee for the Dominican Republic.

American officials are said to be involved in the misappropriations, but no detailed information is obtainable.

I am informed from official sources that sufficient evidence has been obtained to begin prosecutions, but that the American minister, James M. Sullivan, has caused further action in the matter to be postponed.

Mr. Sullivan is said to have acted upon instructions from Secretary of State Bryan, but it can not be learned why Washington desired the matter to be kept quiet at this time.

It is, indeed, to be hoped that Senator Phelan, during his stay in Santo Domingo, will succeed in getting to the bottom of this new scandal, as well as of those which have preceded it.

There are many other phases of the recent activity of the State Department which I should like to discuss, supplementary to my speech of April 2, 1914, on the diplomatic service; I should like to pay my tribute to the thoughtful invitation tendered to the navy of Switzerland to participate in the opening of the Panama Canal; I should like to refer to the strange case of Mr. George Fred Williams, minister to Greece, a lawyer who almost made himself king; I should like to deal with the case of Mr. Madison R. Smith, who was the first white man who ever served as minister to the Haitian end of the island of Santo Domingo, who has eulogized the Secretary of State and Assistant Secretary Osborne as "the greatest diplomats of all time," to assist whom the State Department was obliged to rush down a special secretary to untangle the routine work of his office and who was recently permitted to return permanently to the classic shades of Farmington, Mo.; I should like to take up the case of Robert E. Jeffery, of Newport, Ark., recently appointed minister to Uruguay—a job which, it is said, the Secretary of State turned over bag and baggage to the Arkansas Senators to parcel out to some unusually deserving Democrat from their State; I should like to speculate why young Mr. Hornbrook, of Albany, Oreg., unknown even by name to any of the three Oregon Members of Congress, was appointed minister to Siam—unless, indeed, it is the fact that he is connected with a little weekly newspaper, the Albany Democrat; I should like to scrutinize the ethics of the appointment as vice consul of John L. Cutright, of Lincoln, Nebr., who is the son of an erstwhile political enemy of Mr. Bryan, now reconciled by this appointment, and who wrote so indiscreetly pro-German statements that it was necessary summarily to recall him from his English post. All these are fruitful fields of inquiry, but time is now lacking for any adequate treatment. I may take occasion at some later date to refer to some of them more in detail.

As I said at the outset, my desire has not been to state the entire case against Secretary Bryan, but simply by discussing at some length the history of his relations with a small and relatively obscure sister republic to show the point of view which dominates his public service. The man whom he sent to Santo Domingo is said by so competent and dependable an observer as Mr. Vick to be directly responsible for the revolution that is now raging there. And yet Mr. Sullivan was probably not the worst of the Bryan brood of "diplomats" that went out a year and a half ago to Latin America. We should take warning before even worse results have befallen us. The years 1914 and 1915 will perhaps be reckoned in history as the most momentous of all time. Mighty transitions occur almost daily and pass almost unnoticed. The place of the United States in the world remains to be estab-

lished. Peace or war may hang upon the word of our representatives at home or abroad. Our prosperity and indeed our very existence may depend upon the nod of the President and his chosen assistants. Is it not, then, the right and obligation of every thinking American to demand that the United States be given a Secretary of State who, by ability, unswerving attention to duty, experience, and disinterestedness, may in these most critical of all days be worthy of being compared with the great men in that office upon whom the country has so often depended and of whom it has always been proud?

Some of the newspaper editorials to which I have referred are as follows:

[New York Tribune, Jan. 16, 1915.]

A SECRETARY OF STATE WITHOUT SENSITIVENESS AND WITHOUT SHAME.

No one acquainted with Mr. Bryan's true character could have expected him to wince at the publication of the shameful Vick letter. Since he became Secretary of State he has betrayed a strange lack of sensitiveness to his surroundings. It was a nonappreciation of the delicacies of conduct and traditions of dignity respected by other Secretaries of State which led him into his grotesque exploits on the Chautauqua circuit. His announcement that he felt obliged to supplement his \$12,000 salary with the gate receipts of barnstorming lectures was only the outcropping of a deep streak of coarseness in his makeup. That coarseness has cropped out again and again in his attitude toward appointments to the diplomatic corps. He has tried to treat all the officers he could lay his hands on as party patronage. He is the only Secretary of State in our time who ever set out openly to loot the foreign service. When Mr. Gresham was Secretary in Mr. Cleveland's second term he allowed Josiah Quincy to loot the consular offices. But never before in any excess of partisan covetousness has the head of the department dreamed of sending to a diplomatic agent executing in a foreign country a trust for that country a shameful demand for patronage odds and ends such as Mr. Bryan served on Mr. Walker W. Vick in San Domingo.

"Now that you have arrived and are acquainting yourself with the situation, can you let me know what positions you have at your disposal with which to reward deserving Democrats," wrote the brazen spoilsman who is now filling the place held by Root, Hay, Olney, Blaine, Bayard, Fish, and Seward. Secretaries of State in the old days may have incidentally looked out for party friends in making appointments; but they gave nine-tenths to ninety-nine one-hundredths of their time and thought to the weighty affairs of diplomacy. It is Mr. Bryan's unpardonable offense that in these days of far higher standards of fitness and merit in public appointments he has given nine-tenths to ninety-nine one-hundredths of his time and thought (when not lecturing for private profit) to using the foreign service as an agency to diminish unemployment among former Democratic campaign workers.

Mr. Bryan is not abashed by the publication of the Vick letter. On the contrary, he glories in his spoilsmanship. And why should he not? He simply applied in San Domingo (although the status of the financial commission there is somewhat exceptional) the same policy which filled most of the South American and Central American missions with Bryan protégés entirely innocent of diplomatic experience. In order to pay political debts hanging over from the campaign of 1908 he turned out of office American ministers who had risen from the secretarial grades and had established their capacity as diplomats. It was the same policy which forced the retirement of Ambassador William W. Rockhill, an expert who had spent most of his active life in diplomatic work. Making a place at Petrograd for Pindell, of Peoria, on the terms enlarged on in the celebrated letters attributed to Senator "JIM HAM" LEWIS differed in no essential from the attempted loading down of the Dominican Commission with "deserving Democrats" of small-fry caliber.

Mr. Bryan's incumbency in the State Department has been a failure and a scandal because he has never realized the dignity and importance of his office. He has made American diplomacy a Chautauqua circuit joke. But the fault is not exclusively his. Mr. Wilson has been obliged to tolerate him to a certain extent. Yet that tolerance has been too often flavored with sympathy.

Mr. Bryan's crude spoilsmanship has been permitted to go unre-buked, and even the Vick letter, which the Secretary now glories in, can hardly put a greater strain on the President's capacity for covering over his subordinate's vagaries than have a dozen previous incidents equally illuminative of Mr. Bryan's unfitness for his post. The Pindell letters were repudiated, yet they showed just as clearly as does the Vick document that American diplomacy will be without honor either here or abroad so long as its conduct remains in Mr. Bryan's hands. Mr. Wilson, however, can not escape responsibility for the continuance of the Bryan régime.

[New York World, Jan. 16, 1915.]

MR. BRYAN'S LETTER.

President Wilson's exultation over his success through the agency of postmasters in getting jobs for 30,000 idle workmen was cold and formal in comparison with Secretary Bryan's delight at the prospect that he was going to find official places in Santo Domingo for some of his worthy friends. "You have had enough experience in politics," he wrote to Mr. Vick, American receiver of Dominican customs, "to know how valuable workers are when the campaign is on, and how difficult it is to find suitable rewards for all the deserving."

Mr. Vick's experience, of course, must be brief and uneventful in comparison with Mr. Bryan's, and so anything that the latter may have to say as to the difficulty of rewarding deserving Democrats must be accepted as the well-matured views of a veteran. In truth, while much fault has been found with the Secretary's conduct of the State Department, no one can say that he has ever permitted diplomacy or chautauquas to interfere with the pleasant task of getting offices for such meritorious Democrats as have adhered loyally to his political fortunes.

Let us all admit at once that no other distinguished American has ever shown more industry and gratitude in his humane desire to reduce unemployment among free-silver Democrats; but why did he have to write a letter on the subject?

[New York Herald, Jan. 16, 1915.]

In his letter to Mr. Vick Mr. Bryan reveals himself a spoilsman of the same stripe as Mr. Charles F. Murphy and Mr. Roger C. Sullivan. The

only persons who will be at all surprised by the revelation are those who have been taking him at his own estimate of himself shining through smug professions of political righteousness while chautauquing.

The fact is that Mr. Bryan's main business as Secretary of State has been job hunting for his henchmen, always with preference for those who were true to the "sacred ratio" in 1896.

The revelation of the Vick letter will not injure Mr. Bryan in the eyes of office-hunting Democrats. They, as he, are firmly wedded to the Jacksonian doctrine that to the victors belong the spoils.

But, as President Wilson made clear at Indianapolis, the independent voter holds the balance of power in American politics these days, and the independent voter expects service—not job hunting or mere office holding—from officials of his Government.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Courier-Citizen, Jan. 18, 1915.]

BRYAN TO VICK.

The placid and unctuous Mr. Bryan must be a bit disturbed at the howl that is going up at the discovery of his letter to W. W. Vick, late a receiver of customs in San Domingo, in the course of which he asked that official to look around and see if there were not some more fat jobs to bestow on deserving Democrats from the United States. The text of the letter was something like this:

"Now that you have arrived and are acquainting yourself with the situation, can you not let me know what positions you have at your disposal with which to reward deserving Democrats? Whenever you desire a suggestion from me in regard to a man for any place there call on me."

"You have had enough experience in politics to know how valuable workers are when the campaign is on and how difficult it is to find suitable rewards for all the deserving. I do not know to what extent a knowledge of Spanish is necessary for employees. Let me know what is required, together with the salary, and when appointments are likely to be made."

Mr. Bryan is at least frank about it, nor does he now make any attempt to disavow his letter. It is his doctrine that, in the administration of a sacred trust conferred by politics, even in other countries than our own, the great and first commandment is to bestow the offices on the deserving party workers. If, in the process, the choice falls upon a man of ability as well, it is a happy accident and the public service does not in that case suffer. If in other cases it does suffer—as it did in some of the instances in San Domingo—never mind; the deserving Democrats have at least been paid off, and that's what we're here for!

The chorus of protest against this candid confession of a super-Jacksonian doctrine of spoilsmanship comes from the leading journals of both great parties. Mr. Bryan is frankly informed, for example, by the Springfield Republican that he has inflicted an "irreparable injury" on the whole Wilson administration, and the demand for his immediate resignation comes from about every quarter. The chances are, however, that Mr. Bryan will not resign, and that Mr. Wilson will not ask him to. Mr. Wilson is about as fatuously pachydermatous in such matters as Mr. Bryan himself and will probably go right along, not only tolerating Mr. Bryan but blandly approving all his works, including the letter to Mr. Vick on the primal necessity of putting none but faithful Democrats on guard, no matter what becomes of the good of the service. Of course, there is serious danger of splitting the party by breaking with Mr. Bryan, but there is a danger no less serious in keeping in with him. The administration is in a position not unlike that of the soldier who remarked: "I'll be hanged if I don't, and I'll be shot if I do." Mr. Wilson can not afford to retain Mr. Bryan, whose presence is increasingly a millstone hung about the administrative neck; and yet he can not afford to come to an open breach with him. It is this which makes the Springfield Republican—a strong friend of the President and of his general type—to remark gloomily that the Vick letter from Mr. Bryan's hand has done "irreparable injury" to the whole Wilson régime. If it hasn't, it should.

The trouble with the ancient ideal of partisan spoilsmanship professed so candidly by Mr. Bryan is that so many pesky independents in these days don't accept it, and their approval is highly desirable to secure. Inasmuch as it is they who commonly dictate the result of elections, by voting this way or that according to their belief, it ill becomes the party benefited by their momentary favor to take it as an ample warrant for a saturnalia of spoils mongering, whether that party be the Republican or the Democratic. Mr. Wilson in particular, being a "minority President," has small ground for assuming that a charter was conferred upon him in 1912 by the popular will to use the Government patronage to reward Bryanistic Democrats. In a word, Mr. Bryan's retrospective gratitude is outrageously bad politics, as well as discreditable statesmanship. It can do nothing but ruin his chief, for the sake of paying off a lot of Mr. Bryan's own political debts.

[Lowell (Mass.) Courier-Citizen, Jan. 19, 1915, from the Springfield Republican.]

MR. BRYAN, ARCH SPOILSMAN.

The very grave damage Secretary Bryan has done the Wilson administration by his staggering letter on jobs for "deserving Democrats," written to Mr. Vick, formerly United States receiver of customs in San Domingo, is irreparable. Nothing Mr. Bryan has ever said or done crystallizes his repulsively Jacksonian spoils principles like this letter.

It is nothing new that he is still living in the political atmosphere of Van Buren, Marcy, and Thurlow Weed in matters relating to the civil service. With all of his zeal for "reform," Mr. Bryan has frankly remained a spoilsman curiously filled with absurd notions to the effect that "life tenure" even in minor offices was undemocratic and that party workers should be rewarded at the expense of administrative efficiency in public office.

But the Vick letter is more of a shock than it could have been when Mr. Bryan first ran for President, nearly 20 years ago, upon a platform that gave precious little encouragement to civil service reformers. When he was the third time a candidate, in 1908, he seemed to have become more civilized in this particular, for the Denver platform drafted by himself declared: "The laws pertaining to the civil service should be honestly and rigidly enforced to the end that merit and ability shall be the standard of appointment and promotion rather than services rendered to a political party."

Finally in office, although not in the position of chief, Mr. Bryan has used all his influence in the administration to reward "deserving Democrats" solely because of "services rendered to a political party." That he has been an unblinking job hunter for party friends, even at the expense of San Domingo, is proved so conclusively by the Vick

letter that he defiantly acknowledges its authenticity. "I am glad to have the public know," he said yesterday, "that I appreciate the services of those who work in politics and feel an interest in seeing them rewarded, and, as Mr. Vick received his appointment for political work, I thought he was a good man to address and express my opinion on the subject."

Mr. Bryan's pachydermous and benighted attitude, it is needless to point out, outrages that powerful sentiment in the country which sustains the merit as against the political principle in filling administrative offices, a sentiment which is the product of a generation of laborious agitation and which will not suffer the civil service of the United States to be cast back into the muck heap of spoils mongering without a bitter protest and struggle. Mr. Bryan's offense is magnified many times because of his high position in the administration, for he has an influence second only to that of the President himself, and such unblushing utterances from him must deeply alarm as well as affront the best citizenship of the land.

If Mr. Bryan "made" the Wilson administration, it is very possible that he will also destroy its chances of indorsement by the people in the next presidential election. His political support of the President has thus far been of incalculable value in maintaining a strong administration party in Congress, and it is virtually impossible for Mr. Wilson to continue in a party leadership that admits of no challenge without Mr. Bryan's sincere and cordial aid. That is why the damage done by the Vick letter is irreparable. The President can not force the retirement of Mr. Bryan without dividing his party and wrecking his administration.

[From the Boston Advertiser, Jan. 19, 1915.]

BRYAN MUST GO.

We have been disposed, while the present war in Europe was going on, to make every possible allowance of charity and forbearance for the blunders of the present administration. But in the name of national decency and national honor it must be plain to every self-respecting American to-day that William Jennings Bryan should not be retained in his present post, at the head of the Department of State, a moment longer than it will take President Wilson to demand formally and in some public fashion Mr. Bryan's resignation.

It is useless to try to mince matters. Bryan has shown himself unfit for the position. His ideals of filling the diplomatic and consular service with his impossible creatures of the Sullivan stripe; his determined attempts to slather the whitewash brush over the worst scandals that have protruded themselves and that now smell to high heaven; these things make it impossible for President Wilson to retain him any longer without losing his own self-respect, as well as the respect of the people of this country.

Not only must Secretary Bryan resign; he must resign at once, in such prompt and sudden fashion as will leave no room for doubt that he goes at the demand of the President and of the American people alike.

The Santo Dominican scandal is the worst exposure of the State Department's blundering, but it is not the only one. Mr. Bryan's appointees have been making trouble in Europe, too—how much we can learn probably only at the close of the war. Bumptious, ignorant, open to suspicion on other grounds, the antics of some of these men have failed to attract much public notice, only because graver issues are at stake over there. The way in which the State Department tried to force Ambassador Herrick from his post at the time when his services were vitally necessary is an old story.

But the Santo Dominican exposures present the most enlightenment because this is the only case in which all the facts have been brought out plainly. We have, at the outset, a deal of Tammany men who wanted to exploit Santo Domingo to fill their own pockets. We have these unscrupulous men picking their tools and telling Bryan whom to put there. We have some of these men swaggering around among the punctilious people of the little island with the manners of barroom toughs and the morals of gold-brick operators. We see the honest Americans who still remain in office in the islands protesting—not to Bryan alone, but to the President, too, it should be remembered—with the result that the honest men had to resign to retain their self-respect. And when men came to Bryan with the proofs, we have seen the chilly reception which they had to endure.

But in public, while all this was going on, we saw Mr. Bryan—saintly as a Pecksniff or a Chadband—preaching "our obligations to the people of the Latin-Americas," expatiating on our obligations to treat them with scrupulous honesty and the highest ideals of Christian statesmanship. The unctuous hypocrisy shown in the contrast between public profession and private performance have been made patent to the people of Latin America much longer than to the people of North America. At this time of all times, when the American people have begun to desire the closest possible relations of friendship and honorable amity with the States of Latin America, it is self-evident that Bryan must not be kept in office a day longer than is necessary to complete the plans for his ignominious exit. The good faith and the honor of the American Nation demand his hasty and undignified expulsion from the State Department.

This can not be a partisan question. Neither the President nor the Democratic Party can afford for an instant to stand by or to defend Bryan. The facts in the case, the clear, convincing testimony of all the principals in the Santo Domingo investigation, bear incontestable testimony to Mr. Bryan's frantic use of the whitewash brush to conceal the facts from the American people. There was even given out from the State Department what purported to be a summary of an "impartial investigation" conducted by some disinterested men clearing Minister Sullivan; and on the basis of that investigation the State Department attempted to close the case. It now appears that the alleged investigation was a downright fake. Not one of the men mentioned had consented to touch the affair, and certainly not one gave Mr. Bryan the right to use his name in that connection.

The frantic appeals of Mr. Bryan to American agents in Santo Domingo to let him know at once of any opportunity to fill the service with his spoils men, his evident willingness to crowd political derelicts into the public service, these are among the other bad features of his rule in the State Department. An out-and-out spoilsman of the Bourbon type, packing public offices with the political wrecks who were "down and out," his influence upon our public service will not soon be cleansed away unless his appointees are sent packing, too, when he goes. In any case, however, he must go; and he can not go any too soon.

[Lowell (Mass.) Courier-Citizen, Jan. 20, 1915, from the Providence Journal.]

"A VERY NASTY MESS."

A witness before the commissioner appointed by the President to investigate the behavior of the American minister to Santo Domingo, "considers this a very nasty mess."

It is one of the nastiest that cheap politics has ever produced. The nastiness is magnified because the cheap politics have their source in the highest quarters, the State Department. And the offense to public sentiment is aggravated by the fact that the consequences are not alone of domestic concern, but involve our foreign relations.

The national good faith has been discredited by the cheap politician in whom the President has chosen to confide it—Bryan. An intelligent administration of the State Department has not been looked for from the beginning. The neglect and blundering of Bryan have simply justified general expectation. But the American people might have supposed that the administration would be clean-handed.

Santo Domingo is as remote from the mind of the average American as Tibet. A nasty mess down there might have escaped public attention had it not become too nasty for one of the administration's own representatives to endure. Much of the testimony so far furnished is ex parte. But, at least—considering that it is out of the mouths of Democrats, testifying before a Democratic investigator and relating entirely to Democratic officials—it will not be impugned on the ground of partisan prejudice.

That accidental exhibit of documentary evidence—the Bryan letter to Vick, receiver of customs for Santo Domingo, imploring assistance to find jobs for "deserving Democrats" on the Dominican Government pay roll—is an unanswerable indictment. The disclosure amounts to a contemptible abuse of public trust. Minister Sullivan's case becomes of secondary importance. The President should call for Bryan's resignation from the Cabinet. It is no longer a question of fitness, but of decency.

Washington's tutelage of Santo Domingo was undertaken some 10 years ago. The arrangement is that an American representative has charge of the Dominican customs; and he turns over to the Dominican Government 45 per cent, withholding 55 per cent for the liquidation of the foreign debt. There is no meddling with domestic affairs, no restraint on the habit of getting up revolutions—but revolutionists must let the customhouses alone. Santo Domingo's credit is being restored, and the menace of foreign intervention for the collection of debts is removed.

This prosperity seems to have invited a descent on Santo Domingo by contractors of the Tammany stripe. The charges against Minister Sullivan indicate that the scheme was to organize a monopoly of public works down there. Santo Domingo was to be exploited. The treasury, which the Government at Washington has heretofore tried to conserve, was to be looted.

Not a "service to mankind," but "a very nasty mess."

[From the New York World, Jan. 21, 1915.]

BRYANIZED DOLLAR DIPLOMACY.

The State Department under the dollar-diplomacy ideas of Secretary Knox may have been an agency for the easy use of financial freebooters in tropical America or elsewhere. But the State Department under William J. Bryan is giving instances of equal subservency.

Whatever else may develop in the investigation of James M. Sullivan's appointment as minister to Santo Domingo, its absurd unfitness has already been amply proved, as well as its intimate relations with scheming contractors and exploiters. What Sullivan at the worst may be in this unsavory mess remains to be determined. But what Sullivan at the best has been shown to be is the tool of those contract workers of the Tammany political school who secured his appointment.

Sullivan's qualifications for a diplomatic post were so notoriously lacking that he himself apparently never dreamed of seeking such a position until he was put up to it by the Jarvis-Banco Nacional interests in the island. Secretary Bryan could not have been fooled in the first instance if he had been alive to his duties. But his later whitewashing of Sullivan and suppression of evidence of unfitness forced upon his attention show that from first to last his chief object had been to take care of "deserving Democrats."

The scandal has reached a stage where it must command the anxious attention of the President.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Courier-Citizen, Jan. 23, 1915.]

SLAMMING MR. BRYAN.

There have been lots of cutting things said about William Jennings Bryan, first and last, by his political opponents, all the way from 1896 to 1915; but it remains for a vallant supporter of the Democratic administration to hand him the most staggering blow yet delivered since he was revealed by his own correspondence to Mr. Vick as "the prince of job hunters." Let us quote a few paragraphs from the editorial recently printed by the New York Nation (and Evening Post) in which the matter was considered, merely adding that this differs only in bitterness of criticism from similar comments printed in other journals quite as friendly to President Wilson and his party:

"This letter is probably the most disgraceful thing ever written by any American Secretary of State. The trail of the spoilsman is over it all. Note the date, August 20, 1913. At that time many critical matters were pressing upon the attention of the State Department. The Mexican volcano was rumbling toward explosion. Yet the Secretary of State, his anterooms and corridors stuffed as they were for weeks with political dependents of his clamoring for jobs, was giving his thought to offices, and began looking around in helpless Santo Domingo to find 'suitable rewards' for those who had done party work for him. Such a letter on official State Department paper! Rummage the archives from the beginning, and you will find nothing so unworthy, so humiliating, so near an approach to the infinitely mean."

"What makes the affair peculiarly contemptible is the fact that Mr. Bryan was trying to get jobs for his friends in a service which the United States had undertaken as a solemn trust. On that subject no one had made finer flourishes than Mr. Bryan himself. We were to prove the 'disinterested' friendship of this Nation. We were to remove suspicion by setting our face like a flint against anything that looked like exploitation or self-seeking. And after all these noble words, this indecent request: 'Let me know what positions you have at your disposal!' The former receiver of Dominican customs has put in evidence what were his instructions from a former Secretary of State."

Mr. Root enjoined the receiver that his work was essentially that of a trustee. He was to consider himself as an administrator of trust funds. As a matter of fact, until the advent of Mr. Bryan in the State Department, there was no hint that politics had been allowed to sway the Dominican service discharged by us. Certainly there were no such scandals as have ever since been crawling to the surface. But why talk of scandals among subordinates when the chief scandal of all has been brought directly home to the Secretary of State?

It was known long ago that no comparison existed between such a Secretary of State as Mr. Bryan and such a Secretary of State as ELIHU ROOT. The latter is probably the most accomplished statesman we have living among us to-day, and Mr. Bryan about as underheaded a public official as ever got into prominence. Yet Mr. Root was a rich and wicked corporation lawyer, and Mr. Bryan is a poor and pious lover of his fellow men! What a pity to have the latter shown up as so disregarding of a sacred governmental trust, in contradistinction to the former! But the Nation goes on to say:

"Admit that Mr. Bryan wrote the letter without one twinge. What does that prove? What but that the Secretary of State is so dense where he ought to be delicate, so callous where he ought to be sensitive, that he does things to shock the general sense of propriety and of morals without the glimmer of an idea that he is giving offense? Than this no severer condemnation could be passed upon a public man. We saw a revelation of such dull apprehension on Mr. Bryan's part when he went off Chautauqua-circuiting for money and fell into a rage when he found that the mass of the people either made fun of him or denounced him for making rags of the dignity of his office. That was bad enough, but his spoils-grabbing letter is worse. It is worse in itself, and it is worse as revealing the kind of appalling unconsciousness with which Mr. Bryan does discreditable things."

That's just it, exactly. Mr. Bryan hadn't the remotest idea he was not doing right. He even "laughed" when admitting that he wrote the letter, apparently never dreaming that he was bringing down the house upon his own devoted head by his effrontery. He must, in view of the way the entire country has jumped on him since, be a very perplexed and troubled man—for nothing bothers one who is sincerely anxious to do right so much as the overwhelming verdict that he has done a thing so grossly and obviously wrong as to invite universal condemnation. Mr. Bryan must be both puzzled and distressed, but it is highly improbable that even now he sees anything wrong in what he wrote or did. Such is the obtuseness of the man. He ought to resign, of course, and Mr. Wilson should not rest until he has compelled him to; but that either man will do either thing is too good to believe.

[From the Boston Advertiser, Feb. 3, 1915.]

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

When the astounding revelations were first made, as to the policies under which the State Department was conducted, we hoped that President Wilson would act in the only possible effectual way to end that scandal. But he is showing himself as narrow a partisan as Bryan himself. Whatever Bryan stands for—and we sincerely regret that it is so—President Wilson stands for.

When it was first known that Bryan had made the State Department an employment bureau for "deserving Democrats"; when his plaint was first made public "how valuable workers are when the campaign is on, and how difficult it is to find suitable rewards for the deserving," the public looked to see the President in righteous protest against peddling the places in our diplomatic service as the reward of political jobbery. Beers, Vick, Pulliam, and all the others say, however, that all the facts were laid before the President long before the general public knew of the scandal. And it appears that these men were told either to keep their mouths shut or to get out of office.

When Sullivan astounded Latin Americans by holding his official levees in a condition of semideshabille the protests went to the White House. When the grave charges of political influence in the Dominican finances were formulated, they went to the White House. Now that a deficit of something like \$15,000,000 is reported, and a new scandal is certain to be unearthed, we are told that the White House was warned last year of the dangers of mixing politics and business. But the President has stood resolutely by Bryan, because of his sympathy with Bryan's Bourbonism. And he stood by Sullivan, because the former associate of "Bald Jack" Rose was a Bryan politician.

In the notable speech made by W. M. Fullerton this week at Ford Hall the speaker declared that it was of absolutely vital importance to the United States at once to reach a definite diplomatic agreement, a settled understanding, with the nations of South and Central America. With a reticence in itself significant as to the basis for that warning, Mr. Fullerton, from his thorough knowledge of secret diplomacy in Europe, said that there could be "nothing more important" to the future safety of the United States.

Yet to-day we find all Latin America bitter over the revelations made as to the way in which Bryan has been peddling his offices in those countries as prizes among the "down and out" political fraternity of the Royal Bryan Rooters. When it is vitally necessary that our commercial relations should be closest, when all this hemisphere should be acting as one, we find the Bryan men in Latin America utterly without influence, utterly without initiative, absolutely a drag on every vital undertaking. What has been done that counts has been in spite of the bitter feeling which the blunderings of Bryan's loot of the offices have caused. Every business man in this country knows it. Every business man has been astounded by the indifference of the President to one of the worst scandals in national politics to-day.

And the pity of it is that good men in no less than 22 Latin American posts were displaced to make room for Bryan's "heelers."

Is the explanation of the President's astonishing attitude to be found in his recent Indianapolis speech?

A year ago all of us believed that Woodrow Wilson was the last man in public life to tolerate political rascality, to allow the public offices to be traded for political support. But the Woodrow Wilson of a year ago is not the man who spoke at Indianapolis, who threatened with "political extinction" every Democrat who dared to protest against the growing scandals of this administration. Reluctant as most of us have been to reach that conclusion, is there much room for doubt that the President, in order to make sure of a renomination, has determined to stand by the disgraceful Bryan policy through thick and thin; to keep him in office in spite of every new exposure; to sacrifice every consideration of high ideals in our foreign service for the sake of Bryan's support in the next Democratic national convention?

In taking that stand, the President shoulders the odium of the whole business. He has chosen deliberately. And with that choice must end his former promise of patriotic statesmanship.

[From the New York Sun, Feb. 18, 1915.]

THE NEW ERA IN WASHINGTON AND CARNEGIE HALL.

Owing to the exigencies of newspaper mechanics the Sun was prevented on Tuesday evening from assembling in juxtaposition two interesting announcements whose mutually illuminative significance obviously requires that they should be read together. We now bestow upon them that contiguity they so richly merit. The first of this twain was in a news dispatch:

"WORK TOO MUCH FOR BRYAN—SECRETARY ENLISTS AID OF FORMER TAFT OFFICIAL."

"WASHINGTON, February 16.

"Because of the rapidly multiplying problems confronting the State Department in connection with the European war Secretary Bryan has been forced to enlist the aid of Chandler P. Anderson, counselor to the department in the Taft administration, to act as an additional adviser."

"Announcement to this effect was made by Mr. Bryan this afternoon." The second member of the pair was in the space devoted to advertising the amusements offered by far-sighted and enterprising entrepreneurs for the entertainment of this town:

"CARNEGIE HALL, WED. EVE., FEB. 24—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY BRYAN ON 'THE NEW ERA'—SEATS, \$1.50 TO 25C. AT BOX OFFICE."

The proud consciousness of having done our duty is the sole reward we crave for the unsought and unpaid repetition of this notice, and we sincerely trust that the presence of Mr. Anderson in the Department of State will render it unnecessary for the Secretary of State to cancel his lecture engagement, no matter what the international situation may be on February 24.

In addition to the excerpts which appear in the above-quoted editorial of the Lowell (Mass.) Courier-Citizen, dated January 23, 1915, The Nation says further:

The shocking letter by Secretary Bryan put in evidence in the Santo Domingo inquiry, was really a by-product of that investigation. What is being looked into, at the President's direction, is the doings of Minister Sullivan. He has been charged with grave improprieties and derelictions. When he was appointed there was much lifting of eyebrows at the choice of a man with such a record for such a post. The position was one of the few reserved by long custom for colored men, but the Department of State explained that it wanted a man of special competence to deal with the delicate and complex questions arising in the Dominican Republic. This was felt at the time to be a pretense. Sullivan's selection and his career in Santo Domingo make it a plain sham and fraud. And the unblushing way in which Mr. Bryan at once appealed to Mr. Vick, the new American receiver of Dominican customs, to let him know how many "deserving Democrats," at what salaries, could be foisted upon the Dominican service, shows what was the chief thing in his mind.

We know of no defense of Mr. Bryan in this matter which will not heighten his offense. It may be said that he was not aware that he was doing anything to be ashamed of. He never did take any interest in civil-service reform. The whole-hog principle always seemed about right to him. It was good Nebraska fashion to peddle out all available offices to one's friends. Nobody had so many needy friends as Mr. Bryan when he went to Washington. They were fairly encamped about him. Their pleading eyes looked up to him to be fed. How could he resist the appeal of his old campaigners who sat "three" in a chair in front of his door? And if jobs were to be had in Santo Domingo, why not go straight after them?

Those who, in their admirable simplicity, do God's will and know it not, are the subject of high praise by the poet. But what is to be said of those who do the will of the wicked and know it not? This at least may be said, that they will be regarded by intelligent Americans as having committed the unforgivable political sin, and to be unfit to represent them in high office. It is a calm judgment that Mr. Bryan has exhausted his usefulness to the administration, and is now a burden upon it. President Wilson must be wishing that the Secretary would write another letter—one containing his resignation.

APPENDIX.

1907.

CONVENTION PROVIDING FOR THE ASSISTANCE OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE COLLECTION AND APPLICATION OF THE CUSTOMS REVENUES OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.

CONCLUDED FEBRUARY 8, 1907; RATIFICATION ADVISED BY THE SENATE FEBRUARY 25, 1907; RATIFIED BY THE PRESIDENT JUNE 22, 1907; RATIFICATIONS EXCHANGED JULY 8, 1907; PROCLAIMED JULY 25, 1907.

Articles.

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| I. Receiver. | IV. Accounts of receiver. |
| II. Payment of customs revenues. | V. Ratification. |
| III. Public debt. | |

Whereas during disturbed political conditions in the Dominican Republic debts and claims have been created, some by regular and some by revolutionary governments, many of doubtful validity in whole or in part, and amounting in all to over \$30,000,000, nominal or face value;

And whereas the same conditions have prevented the peaceable and continuous collection and application of national revenues for payment of interest or principal of such debts or for liquidation and settlement of such claims; and the said debts and claims continually increase by accretion of interest and are a grievous burden upon the people of the Dominican Republic and a barrier to their improvement and prosperity;

And whereas the Dominican Government has now effected a conditional adjustment and settlement of said debts and claims under which all its foreign creditors have agreed to accept about \$12,407,000 for debts and claims amounting to about \$21,184,000 of nominal or face value, and the holders of internal debts or claims of about \$2,028,258 nominal or face value have agreed to accept about \$645,827 therefor, and the remaining holders of internal debts or claims on the same basis as the assents already given will receive about \$2,400,000 therefor, which sum the Dominican Government has fixed and determined as the amount which it will pay to such remaining internal debt holders; making the total payments under such adjustment and settlement, including interest as adjusted and claims not yet liquidated, amount to not more than about \$17,000,000;

And whereas a part of such plan of settlement is the issue and sale of bonds of the Dominican Republic to the amount of \$20,000,000, bearing 5 per cent interest payable in 50 years and redeemable after

10 years at 102½ and requiring payment of at least 1 per cent per annum for amortization, the proceeds of said bonds, together with such funds as are now deposited for the benefit of creditors from customs revenues of the Dominican Republic heretofore received, after payment of the expenses of such adjustment, to be applied first to the payment of said debts and claims as adjusted, and second out of the balance remaining to the retirement and extinction of certain concessions and harbor monopolies which are a burden and hindrance to the commerce of the country, and third, the entire balance still remaining to the construction of certain railroads and bridges and other public improvements necessary to the industrial development of the country;

And whereas the whole of said plan is conditioned and dependent upon the assistance of the United States in the collection of customs revenues of the Dominican Republic and the application thereof so far as necessary to the interest upon and the amortization and redemption of said bonds, and the Dominican Republic has requested the United States to give and the United States is willing to give such assistance;

The Dominican Government, represented by its minister of state for foreign relations, Emiliano Tejera, and its minister of state for finance and commerce, Federico Velasquez H., and the United States Government, represented by Thomas C. Dawson, minister resident and consul general of the United States to the Dominican Republic, have agreed;

I. That the President of the United States shall appoint a general receiver of Dominican customs, who, with such assistant receivers and other employees of the receivership as shall be appointed by the President of the United States in his discretion, shall collect all the customs duties accruing at the several customs houses of the Dominican Republic until the payment or retirement of any and all bonds issued by the Dominican Government in accordance with the plan and under the limitations as to terms and amounts hereinbefore recited; and said general receiver shall apply the sums so collected as follows:

First, to paying the expenses of the receivership; second, to the payment of interest upon said bonds; third, to the payment of the annual sums provided for amortization of said bonds, including interest upon all bonds held in sinking fund; fourth, to the purchase and cancellation or the retirement and cancellation pursuant to the terms thereof of any of said bonds as may be directed by the Dominican Government; fifth, the remainder to be paid to the Dominican Government.

The method of distributing the current collections of revenue in order to accomplish the application thereof as hereinbefore provided shall be as follows:

The expenses of the receivership shall be paid by the receiver as they arise. The allowance to the general receiver and his assistants for the expenses of collecting the revenues shall not exceed 5 per cent unless by agreement between the two Governments.

On the first day of each calendar month the sum of \$100,000 shall be paid over by the receiver to the fiscal agent of the loan, and the remaining collection of the last preceding month shall be paid over to the Dominican Government or applied to the sinking fund for the purchase or redemption of bonds, as the Dominican Government shall direct: *Provided*, That in case the customs revenues collected by the general receiver shall in any year exceed the sum of \$3,000,000, one-half of the surplus above such sum of \$3,000,000 shall be applied to the sinking fund for the redemption of bonds.

II. The Dominican Government will provide by law for the payment of all customs duties to the general receiver and his assistants, and will give to them all needful aid and assistance and full protection to the extent of its powers. The Government of the United States will give to the general receiver and his assistants such protection as it may find to be requisite for the performance of their duties.

III. Until the Dominican Republic has paid the whole amount of the bonds of the debt its public debt shall not be increased except by previous agreement between the Dominican Government and the United States. A like agreement shall be necessary to modify the import duties, it being an indispensable condition for the modification of such duties that the Dominican Executive demonstrate and that the President of the United States recognize that, on the basis of exportations and importations to the like amount and the like character during the two years preceding that in which it is desired to make such modification, the total net customs receipts would at such altered rates of duties have been for each of such two years in excess of the sum of \$2,000,000 United States gold.

IV. The accounts of the general receiver shall be rendered monthly to the Contaduria General of the Dominican Republic and to the State Department of the United States, and shall be subject to examination and verification by the appropriate officers of the Dominican and the United States Governments.

V. This agreement shall take effect after its approval by the Senate of the United States and the Congress of the Dominican Republic.

Done in four originals, two being in the English language and two in the Spanish, and the representatives of the high contracting parties signing them in the city of Santo Domingo this 8th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1907.

THOMAS C. DAWSON.
EMILIANO TEJERA.
FEDERICO VELASQUEZ H.

Mr. HAMILL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, when I came into the House this morning I did not have the slightest idea of injecting myself into any discussion on the topics which form the subject of to-day's business. I listened to the arraignment of Mr. Sullivan by my friend from Massachusetts, and I have arisen to shed some light upon the subject, not because I am interested in the slightest way in the matter, but simply because I happen to know something about it.

For one of the standing of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS], his attack on Mr. Sullivan on this floor was, to say the least, most amazing. I believe that ordinarily when one talks about a subject in a way that would involve the character of another man, he should at least in the interest of justice inform himself of the facts in the case.

I make two objections to the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS]. First of all, the matter is now under investigation by a committee which has not yet finished taking the testimony; and, second, that the testimony

at hand is mostly one-sided and against the minister to Santo Domingo, and that the gentleman did not submit even all of that, although he might without much effort had laid his hands upon it.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMILL. Yes; with pleasure; because we want to have this thing correct.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman realizes that in these days the public must depend for enlightenment largely upon newspaper accounts of current events, and the gentleman knows to what extent newspapers are quoted and used on the floor. I have undertaken to read everything bearing on the case of Mr. Sullivan. I have undertaken to make no statement based merely upon my own inference or opinion. I shall be glad to furnish references to every statement I have made, and the sources thereof. In 30 or 40 minutes, of course, I could not quote verbatim the enormous mass of testimony. I tried to give a fair résumé of the testimony without even discussing the alleged contract frauds, the exact facts in connection with which seem to be in dispute.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Will the gentleman from New Jersey yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HAMILL. I will.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Inasmuch as the reports are newspaper talk and fragmentary, is not that a greater reason why the gentleman should refrain from giving it until the official testimony is in?

Mr. ROGERS. All the testimony has been taken except the defense of Mr. Sullivan himself at Santo Domingo.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Then the gentleman is prejudging his case.

Mr. ROGERS. I am not; I have given the uncontroverted testimony of Democrats—of Mr. Vick, a favorite son of the Democratic administration and the personal representative of the Secretary of War.

Mr. HAMILL. The gentleman says he has read all the available newspaper accounts. Let me say that he could not have done so. He speaks of Mr. Sullivan's connection as counsel with the case of "Bald Jack" Rose. Does he find anything in that which would reflect upon him? Consider that Mr. Roor, who committed this sacred trust of Santo Domingo to somebody or other to carry out, was, so I understand, one of the counsel who defended William Tweed when he was tried and convicted of certain criminal charges. Again, if the gentleman had read one of the New York papers—I think the New York Sun—he would have found that Mr. Whitman, then New York district attorney, but now governor of New York, wrote a letter of indorsement for Mr. Sullivan, declaring that he aided the State and that his conduct in that case was very commendable.

Mr. ROGERS. I did not criticize the gentleman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey yield?

Mr. HAMILL. Not just now, not until I finish the statement. Furthermore, when "Bald Jack" Rose took the stand—I have not the honor of the acquaintance of that distinguished personage, who, I believe, is now engaged on the lecture platform, and I am merely concerned with what he said—when he took the stand, he said, in effect, that he had a grudge against Sullivan, either then or after the trial, and when asked why, he said it was because Sullivan insisted that he tell the whole truth, and he did not want to tell the whole truth. Is there anything dishonorable about that? Let us be fair, since we are talking about men's characters.

Mr. ROGERS. Oh, the gentleman wants to be fair—

Mr. HAMILL. Absolutely, and if I am not it is unintentional, just as I feel that if the gentleman is not fair it is unintentional on his part.

Mr. ROGERS. The only mention I made of "Bald Jack" Rose was to refer to the fact that Sullivan had been his defender in the trial, and to say that that circumstance could not have been the reason for his selection as minister to the Dominican Republic; I think the gentleman will agree with me that my statement was correct.

Mr. HAMILL. Yes; but the remark was injected into the discussion not as an explanatory statement as to who Sullivan was, but in order to give an impression of the character of Sullivan by the character of his client.

Mr. ROGERS. I wanted to give a little local color, and that was absolutely the only reason for the reference.

Mr. HAMILL. Yes; but it is a rule of law that in quoting a statement you should quote the whole statement, and in describing Mr. Sullivan from the character of his client you ought to state all you know about him in connection with that client.

Mr. BRITTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMILL. Yes; but I want to say to the gentleman that I was accorded only 10 minutes, and if he will get me sufficient time to finish I will yield the whole day to him.

Mr. BRITTEN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that "Bald Jack" Rose was now lecturing with the Secretary of State? [Laughter.]

Mr. HAMILL. I, of course, do not know; but, considering the fluency bordering on flippancy of the gentleman, I think he himself would make a splendid collector with Jack Rose. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMILL. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. This whole controversy hinges on the statement of Walter Vick?

Mr. HAMILL. Absolutely.

Mr. MURDOCK. I read somewhere in the course of this controversy that somebody said that Vick was a "sorehead." What has the gentleman to say on that subject?

Mr. HAMILL. I think if the gentleman will read the newspapers he will find two or three statements to that effect, but I am not characterizing Mr. Vick or anybody else.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. HAMILL. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman to yield me some more time.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. HAMILL. Ten minutes.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I have not the time to yield the gentleman all of that. I yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. HAMILL. Mr. Chairman, just one other matter in connection with this case. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] narrated Commissioner Phelan's remarks to the effect that he thought the lord mayoralty consisted mostly in clothes, and that he did not take dinner with that official on that account; but if you had read further in the testimony—and I do not know whether this was in the newspapers and therefore can not object to my friend for not using it—you would have noticed that Mr. Phelan said that the man was so unconscious of the fact that he had committed an offense that on the next evening, I think it was, he took dinner with him, on which occasion he was surrounded with all the pomp and circumstance of his office. I have only this to say. I have no interest in this question one way or the other. I happen to know something about it, and I want to give what little I do know to the gentlemen of the House. This topic is under discussion. I say wait until all of the facts are before us and do not prejudice anybody. I am sure that on second thought my friend, who wants to be just, would not in any way intentionally do a man an injury. I say wait until this committee reports. My friend says that he understands there is nothing more to be taken except the defense of Mr. Sullivan. I understand there is a great deal of testimony to be taken on the very points he raised, namely, as to the acceptability of the minister to the people of the Dominican Republic.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMILL. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. I want to remind the gentleman that my speech was not an attack or intended as an attack on Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan was minister there as a result of the decision of the Secretary of State. My charge and my grievance are against the Secretary of State for his conduct of the Diplomatic Service. I wish the gentleman, before he sits down, would give a little attention to that aspect of the case.

Mr. HAMILL. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that it is my province to defend a department which is so well able to take care of itself. Whether the Department of State acted wisely or unwisely will depend on the very thing that the gentleman assumes, as to whether or not these charges that he opens are true. But here is my opinion, if you want it, regarding the "deserving Democrat" letter. Of course, I know that the Republicans are so unquestionably altruistic and so possessed and obsessed with the frantic endeavor to serve the people and the people alone that they would not reward the deserving Republicans. Oh, no! But, outside of that, is it not proper for any department to select for certain positions where the occupant will have it within his power to either injure or assist the administration—is it not good statesmanship, as well as good politics, to select men who are in sympathy with them, and not men who are out of sympathy with them? [Applause on the Democratic side.] The qualifying adjective "deserving" does not necessarily mean anything wrong or sinister. A deserving public man is one who, of course, has rendered party service, but it means deserving in point of ability and attainments as well as in point of political service. You construe the Secre-

tary's letter in a way that suits your own purpose, but it is equally susceptible of a construction such as I have indicated, which would be in favor of and to the credit of the Secretary of State, who wrote the letter. But I am not going to take up the time of the House longer.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I thank you for giving me this opportunity. I merely want to close with one sentence, and say, gentlemen, wait. In the name of American fairness, to which my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] has appealed, let us wait until the entire question is investigated and the facts are before us, and then in the American way let us pronounce a just decision. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM], and I would like to inquire how much time I have consumed.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HARRISON). The gentleman has 44 minutes remaining.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, whoever has traveled abroad and observed the manner in which this Government provides and maintains its diplomatic and consular offices as contrasted with the provision made by other nations must indeed feel ashamed of our neglect. The United States is a competitor for the world's trade, and if we are to secure that trade we must put forth efforts not only equal to those of our competitors, but we must surpass them. If we are to do this, we must establish our country in the confidence and estimation of the people whose trade we seek. We must impart to them some knowledge of the strength and character of the country which seeks their business. In my opinion, nothing will do more to this end than the maintenance of our diplomatic and consular representatives in those lands in a manner and dignity in harmony with this idea. Sound reasoning dictates that this should be our policy, and I welcome every step to this end.

It is for these reasons that I am especially interested in seeing favorable action by the House on those paragraphs on page 23 of this bill making provision for the acquisition of suitable premises or for the purchase of land and the erection thereon of a suitable building or buildings in which to house the consulate general, the United States court, the jail, the post office, and other offices of the United States at Shanghai, China, and for the purchase of a building located upon the land now leased to the consulate general of the United States at Yokohama, Japan, carrying in all appropriations of \$362,275. I favor the appropriation in these two cases because I am aware of their merits. On broader grounds, and for similar reasons, I believe in the policy of Government-owned diplomatic and consular buildings.

COMMERCIAL IMPORTANCE OF SHANGHAI.

Shanghai is a city of nearly a million inhabitants, located on the Whangpoo River, a short distance from the coast. This river and its connecting waters is to China what the Amazon is to South America and the Mississippi is to the United States. Shanghai is at the same time the New York and New Orleans of China—the great financial and commercial center at the mouth of the principal watercourse, over which trade can be carried to one-third of the entire Empire, and the chief city of the great Yangtse Valley. The principal foreign banking houses, steamship offices, business houses, and foreign consulates of China are in Shanghai. Politically Shanghai is second only to Peking in importance; commercially it is by far the most important port of China and the Far East.

Nearly 42 per cent of the total trade of China goes through Shanghai. Her imports for 1913 amounted to over \$178,000,000 and her exports to over \$129,000,000. The volume of combined business passing through that port was therefore something over \$307,000,000.

REASONS FOR A GOVERNMENT-OWNED CONSULATE.

The prestige that comes from external appearances is more marked in China than perhaps in any country in the world, and has a direct bearing on commercial success. The territory set aside for foreign habitation is quite limited. The number of available foreign buildings suitable for consular purposes is small, and Chinese buildings are in no way suitable. It is not easy, therefore, to obtain quarters large and convenient to commercial and shipping houses. All the principal foreign nations, especially the rivals of the United States for the trade of China, own dignified and often pretentious consular buildings. The United States is the only great Nation which does not own its consular and court buildings in Shanghai, the greatest port in China, notwithstanding that it has adopted the policy of acquiring Government-owned consulates.

The impression of power and size, so necessary to be created on the oriental mind, is of primal importance, for he often

judges the strength, worth, and dignity of a nation by the residence of its representative. This fact is what Germany knows and appreciates, and it was with this view that she has built so extensively and grandly in the Orient. In view of the nation to which they belong and of our own increasing trade interests in this land of wonderful possibilities now opening to foreign trade exploitation, all true Americans would be ashamed to see our Nation go back to the undignified, inconvenient, and inadequate consular quarters formerly furnished by the American Government at Shanghai, while the representatives of other powers are so well provided for.

VALUE OF CHINA'S TRADE.

If you pause for a moment to consider that the Republic of China contains something over 400,000,000 of people; that in 1913 she imported nearly \$428,000,000 worth of goods, and exported something over \$306,000,000 worth; if you bear in mind that the relations existing between the Chinese Government and the Chinese people, and the Government of the United States and the people of the United States, are exceedingly friendly and cordial; that our Republic is regarded as the sincere and traditional friend of China, you will appreciate that with greater energy and initiative upon our part, with a more studious effort applied to capturing the Chinese trade, we could have increased our imports to that country greatly beyond the figure they reached.

Now, if we are to canvass the Orient in quest of our share of its lucrative commerce we must expect to proceed along those lines which have been determined the correct lines to travel. We can not expect to do business contrary to what others have found to be the best business policy and succeed. We certainly can not hope to build up respect for our Government and confidence in our commercial houses unless we appear before these people, who do not know us, in a way to win their respect and confidence. You know, and I know, that with many people appearances go a long way. It should not excite wonder that in the absence of a definite knowledge of you people should judge you by your appearance. It is therefore not surprising that in the absence of more adequate information the people of China and other foreign countries should judge us by the only evidence of our character they have daily before their eyes.

CHARACTER OF OUR REPRESENTATION.

And what evidence have they? Merchant ships flying our flag rarely enter a foreign port. Indeed, the Stars and Stripes are a curiosity in the Orient, unless they be seen on a man-of-war or some other Government-owned vessel stationed in Asiatic waters. And if these people fail to behold any evidence of our Republic manifested in the form of flags on vessels in their harbors, what other tokens have they by which to judge as to the kind and character of nation we are?

Other nations possess the buildings which their diplomatic and consular representatives occupy, maintain them in good condition, and thus create an impression of dignity, stability, and affluence. But the American diplomatic representative and consular officer must hold forth in some rented and temporarily converted private dwelling whose appearance and location make but a poor comparison beside the headquarters of those nations who are our trade competitors.

Is it any wonder, I ask, in the face of such evidence, the Chinaman, or resident of whatever country he may be, should misjudge our character? Surely, if other Governments find it a paying investment to provide befitting headquarters for their diplomatic and consular officers, we should find it equally as profitable to do likewise.

MARYLAND'S INTEREST.

I wish to make plain, Mr. Chairman, that Maryland is deeply interested in this subject. Representing, as I do, a State which has been one of the great commercial States of the Union, a State which embraces the most magnificent bay of the Nation, a bay which is ever alive with ships of commerce, it is but natural that those things which influence or affect our commerce should be of paramount importance to us.

I do not believe that interest in the merits of this subject is confined to those Representatives from our seaboard States; but I can readily understand why Representatives from our seaboard States should be more deeply interested than those hailing from the interior of our country. My people understand, as those of other nations have already learned, that those things which contribute to the increase of commerce are worthy of careful study and consideration. We know full well if other nations have found it to their financial interest to maintain their own buildings in foreign countries in which to house their diplomatic and consular representatives they have come to that conclusion after careful study of the subject, and if they have reached that conclusion, we believe that equal consideration

upon our part would show that it would be a profitable thing for us to follow their example.

The people of Maryland have, to a large extent, always been especially interested in our country's commerce. Since the establishment of our Government Maryland has been a ship-building and ship-sailing State. Maryland sailors and seamen have always been a part of the crews of our men-of-war, and there is hardly a naval battle written in our country's history but what Marylanders took a prominent part.

For these reasons our interest is a natural one. We believe in helping those merchants who carry American goods to foreign shores. We realize that a merchant marine is indispensable, and we appreciate that in the contest for this foreign trade our merchants should have all the assistance and prestige that can be rendered them by our diplomatic and consular officers so situated in foreign lands as to make them influential with the people among whom they are domiciled. We realize that our consular and diplomatic officers can not attain the sphere of influence and usefulness they ought to occupy unless they enjoy a creditable standing among the people of those lands to which they are assigned. We believe that such a standing would be a material aid to us commercially, and for these reasons Maryland is keenly interested in the measure now before the House.

OUR FOREIGN TRADE.

That you may have some adequate conception of the extent of our interest, I wish to point out that in 1914 more than 732 vessels engaged in foreign commerce entered the port of Baltimore, in addition to 1,483 engaged in coastwise commerce. During this same period 826 vessels cleared from the port of Baltimore engaged in foreign commerce, and 1,833 vessels engaged in coastwise traffic.

Our exports in 1914 amounted to \$106,852,045 and our imports were \$29,687,729. Our total foreign trade was estimated at something in the neighborhood of \$136,330,774. It is not remarkable, as you will observe, in view of this vast volume of foreign commerce, that this subject should be one which appeals directly and personally to my district.

We have always been large exporters to foreign countries, as well as importers from those countries. We have always been close to the elbow of competition, and being this close, we have learned what every man learns who engages in a formidable struggle with a competitor who is alive to his opportunities.

We have been taught that when men invest money along certain lines, even though those lines may appear unimportant and without value, it will generally be found upon closer examination that they are productive of good, and if they were not they would not be followed. We have learned that it pays to keep abreast of your competitor. Surpass him if you can, but if you can not surpass him, do not let him surpass you; do not fall behind and get in the vanguard. Now, our consular officers are our trade representatives. If we fail to give them the proper respectability through housing them under appropriate conditions, the people in foreign lands will not only look down upon them but they will look down upon us.

SOUTH AMERICAN TRADE.

The opening of the Panama Canal and the development of our merchant marine will naturally bring us in closer trade relations with many of the countries and people of South America. Our South American friends, with whom we will be endeavoring to do a greater business in the future, are an impressionable race. There can be no denying the fact that our failure to maintain in many of these countries consulates of a class and character favorably comparing with those of other foreign Governments has resulted in a comparison decidedly to our disadvantage and has exerted its influence upon our trade with those countries.

I am firmly of the opinion that, with the inauguration of a policy whereby our consular representatives will be housed in a style befitting their position as representatives of the great North American Republic, such a change will create a better opinion of us and a more favorable attitude toward the business interests of this country.

As between two merchants, one exhibiting every evidence of stability and the other minus those evidences, you would not hesitate a moment in placing your trade. It would go to the one in whom your confidence was the greater. On a larger scale, this is our situation in South America. We are the natural market for supplying many of their demands as well as the chief consumers of much of their raw materials; yet so lamentably have we failed in making the most of our opportunities that European countries have actually beaten us out of these markets at our very door. As an evidence of this, less than two years ago Dr. Lauro S. Muller, the Brazilian minister of foreign affairs, during a visit to this country pointed out that

In 1913 our imports from Brazil amounted to nearly \$124,000,000, while our exports to that country reached only a little over \$34,000,000.

Now that we are awake to the necessity of an American-owned merchant marine and are to have vessels of our own, we should take another step forward and see that every legitimate and proper assistance that can be extended our trade getters in those countries be offered; and the best way to extend this assistance is through making apparent to the people of those countries whose trade we are seeking that they are trading with a first-class business country, and let the surroundings of our representatives bear evidence of that stability with which we would impress them.

A SOUND POLICY.

Permit me to direct the attention of the House to the fact that the ownership by this country of our diplomatic and consular headquarters abroad is not only a wise investment, when considered with reference to its influence in favor of our country, but that, judged purely from the standpoint of a business investment of the Government, it is a policy economically sound.

We can acquire the necessary property, build our embassies and consulates, and maintain them for a sum much less than we now pay in rent. I have heard it said by some men that they could rent a house at a sum less than the interest charged on the money required to purchase it, but I have never known of an instance where the Government could rent a building equally adequate and suitable for its needs for diplomatic or consular headquarters at a price anywhere near that for which the building could be built and maintained by our Government.

The average private building which can be secured by our Government for the use of its consular offices is, as a rule, unsuited to our particular needs. I understand that it is frequently the case that when the proper building can be secured it is unsuited for our use by reason of its location; then where the proper location is decided upon a suitable building is almost impossible to be obtained. The result is obviously a makeshift. Where our consulate is in the proper building it is generally to be found not in the right location.

It is apparent, therefore, that the only solution of the problem is Government-owned consulates, erected on Government-owned ground, permanently maintained by our Government for its use, as other Governments are already doing.

OUR CONSULAR EMPLOYEES.

I am acquainted to some extent with the character of men in our Consular Service and with the nature of the work they are doing. Of these men I can speak only in the highest terms. They are a splendid body of men, thoroughly qualified, competent, and efficient, and doing a valuable work. Probably no other Government in the world is securing more valuable services from its consular employees than those services which are being rendered our Government by the men in its service. Year after year their field of activity is being expanded and the value of their services becoming greater. Men of this character rendering services of such importance should certainly be adequately provided for by the Government they represent. Because of its good work in behalf of American trade and its aid to business men in the United States our Consular Service holds a warm spot in the heart of our business interests, and I am sure that these interests will emphatically approve of any measure the purpose of which is to give our Consular Service a better standing abroad than it now enjoys, and thus to increase its usefulness.

COMPENSATION OF DIPLOMATIC OFFICERS.

And while the opportunity is afforded I want to refer to one deplorable feature of our Diplomatic Service, namely, the neglect of our Government to bear the rental expenses of all our embassy buildings and our failure to pay our diplomatic representatives salaries commensurate with the positions they hold.

It is true that provision has been made for an embassy in Mexico City and that the President recently asked for the purchase of premises for diplomatic headquarters at Habana, Cuba. We now own our headquarters, at Peking, China; Tokyo, Japan; and Bangkok, Siam, and an appropriation was recently authorized for a new building at Tokyo. These were acquired under the act of Congress of February 17, 1911, providing for the purchase and erection of embassy, legation, and consular buildings abroad. If we continue along this line, of course we shall eventually possess adequate buildings in every foreign country where we will be warranted in constructing them; and we certainly need them.

In a number of countries the salaries received by our chief diplomatic officers, I am told, is hardly sufficient to discharge the rent of their official places of residence. These countries therefore can not be represented by other than men of wealth

who can afford to work for the Government without any compensation whatever. But that is not the worst of it; for the usual expenses of entertaining, I am informed, amount to far in excess of the rental costs of suitable quarters for an embassy, with the result that our diplomatic officers must not only suffer the loss of salary, but contribute a substantial sum for the privilege of representing our Government in those countries in which these conditions obtain. As a result, the occupancy of these posts is necessarily confined to men of financial resources with the willingness to pay for what the Government itself should pay. Obviously our Diplomatic Service must have suffered. I make this statement with no reflection upon the men now in the service, or who have been engaged in it in the past, but merely upon the hypothesis that any condition which narrows the number of possible appointees to such posts to those enjoying incomes from private sources must necessarily exclude some men of real ability, precluded from serving by reason of their lack of the necessary financial means.

Our traditional attitude is one of deep-seated aversion to inequality of opportunity. Yet in this situation we find the most flagrant violation of this principle, and one which must necessarily operate to deprive our Diplomatic Service of some of the best men, and thereby prevent that service becoming, as it should be, the embodiment of the greatest skill, experience, and efficiency.

CONCLUSION.

Many reforms in our Diplomatic and Consular Service have been brought about recently. We need the very best men we can secure in the foreign service of this country. We require men of genuine talent and ability, and when we have secured such men, and they have satisfactorily demonstrated their worth, they ought to be rewarded and spurred on to even more valuable efforts. These places ought to be open to all classes of our people possessing the necessary training and qualifications. Under the present arrangement relating to apportionment among the States and the restrictions with which these places are surrounded, through no fault of the officers of our State Department, these appointments do not always go to those possessing the best qualifications for them.

Upon the conclusion of the European war the nations of the earth will enter upon a broader and wider field in their relations. The great victories of the future, I believe, will be those achieved in the battles of diplomacy rather than through the clash of arms. Against that day we must now begin to prepare, unless we would linger in comparative diplomatic and commercial isolation. We must begin the education and training of the best men procurable as representatives capable of looking after our country in all those involved conditions of closer relationship, for it will be through the efforts of men of this character that we shall assume our heritage as a leader in the commercial and political affairs of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Wisconsin to use some time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, as I calculate now, I have 39 minutes remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, the position of this Republic in the family of nations makes it important that we should not be indifferent to the good opinion of mankind touching our foreign policy.

In the time I have I want to refer to the foreign policy of the United States, if it has a foreign policy, and suggest what I regard as an important improvement. It is doubtful if the United States has a foreign policy to-day. Let me illustrate: In the closing days of the last administration a delicate situation arose in a neighboring Republic. The retiring President gave as a reason why he thought it would indicate for him to take any action at that time that the action taken might not be in keeping with the policy of the incoming administration. My contention, Mr. Chairman, is that the foreign policy of the United States should not change with the fortunes of political parties in political campaigns. No other great nation changes its foreign policy as a result of change in political parties. The foreign policy of the United States should be a consistent, continuing policy, maintained by a foreign office that does not change in its personnel below the head of the office with the fortunes of political parties.

I am not criticizing this administration more than any other. I am simply saying that from the foundation of the Republic to the present hour the foreign policy of the country, if it has one, has changed with the political parties as they have changed as a result of a political campaign by political parties and ad-

ministrations rewarding with foreign appointments and responsible positions in the State Department those who have rendered conspicuous political service or given large campaign contributions. This is not the policy of any other nation on earth, and should not be the practice in this. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM], who has just addressed the House, has spoken of the necessity of this Nation having the respect of mankind and of the people with whom we have international relations. But how can foreign nations with a consistent foreign policy, that have foreign offices with men trained in the foreign service, who carry out the policy of their country, have respect for a great nation that gives as a reward to political campaigners or those who have given contributions the office of ambassador or minister to the great countries of the world, and too often without any regard whatever as to their fitness for work in statecraft and diplomacy, as we have just been shown by the case of Santo Domingo.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the fact that our Government is a Government of parties, so-called, what remedy has the gentleman from Kansas to suggest for this condition which he describes?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Simple enough. I would make all officers below the Secretary of State continuing officers. I would not change the Assistant Secretary of State, I would not change the Counselor for the State Department, and I would have officers who are familiar with the precedents and with international law and usage, and also familiar with the details of the office and able to carry out a consecutive foreign policy.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not a fact that, regardless of parties and administrations in the past, with very few exceptions, and small exceptions, too, our representatives abroad have reflected credit upon our country and distinction upon themselves in the discharge of their duties?

Mr. CAMPBELL. In the main, that is true; we were hopelessly weak in our Consular Service until the last 15 years, when we established the merit system in that service.

Mr. BARKLEY rose.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I can not yield further. Until 15 years ago our Consular Service was worse than weak. Since that time we have made the Consular Service a continuing service, and men appointed and promoted in that service now are not appointed or promoted because of their political affiliations or services in political campaigns, but it is different in our foreign service. Our ministers and ambassadors are far more important to the welfare and the peace of our country in the family of nations.

Mr. CLINE. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Make it very brief.

Mr. CLINE. I want to inquire whether you think the retention of the Secretary would not change the policy of the Government; in other words, the undersecretaries would not control the policy of the Government?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The Secretary would rely upon the office. I would make it the policy of the Government of the United States to ignore partisanship in the matter of the foreign policy. [Applause.] For instance, we should have had a foreign policy that would have enabled President Taft to have dealt with the conditions in Mexico in the closing days of his administration that would not have been changed and would not have invited a change by the incoming administration within a few days. The same thing is true of what has been done in Colombia. The policy of one administration with that country has been changed as a result of a change of political parties. We should be above and independent of the influence of foreign nations in our domestic politics. No nation on earth except our own should have any concern as to which political party should be successful in a campaign in the United States. And now that we have become great in the family of nations and our relations are becoming more and more important, naturally foreign nations will participate in our political campaigns and have an interest in them if our foreign policy is to be changed every time political parties change in this country.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I agree absolutely with the attitude of the gentleman from Kansas, but I want to ask him this question: Has he ever tried to obtain legislation to bring about the condition which he describes?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The thought I am giving this House has just suggested itself to me within a few days.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Kansas yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to ask the gentleman how he would proceed to fill vacancies?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Just as they are filled in the Consular Service—by promotions and from an eligible list.

Mr. McKENZIE. By civil service?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; I would make it so that men would have an opportunity in our foreign service to prepare for the foreign service as a career, just as they prepare for our military service, as they prepare for service in the Navy, and I would advance them as they show a fitness for advancement, and I would have houses and equipment, so that men of modern circumstances could go to the Court of St. James, to Paris, to Berlin, and to all the great courts of the world without having a private fortune or the necessity of a private fortune. These are the suggestions that I arose to make while this bill was under consideration. And I think it important not only to the welfare but to the dignity of our country that we cease to appoint men to responsible positions in the State Department and as ambassadors and ministers to reward them for campaign services or campaign contributions. We can no longer be indifferent to the opinions that other nations have of us. There is no question that the nice things the Secretary of State has said to South American Republics are all overturned by what he has done in Santo Domingo. Nations take note of these things, and gauge us and our foreign policy and our lack of foreign policy by what we do. So I urge that the Committee on Foreign Affairs take up the question of a foreign office. I do not know that I would include ambassadors in the classified foreign service at the present time, but ultimately I would include the ambassadors, or as soon as suitable provision can be made in foreign countries for housing them.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] has just said, and there is much force and merit in his views upon the question of a fixed foreign policy in so far as the same may be practicable. I invite his attention to this, that under all conditions, changing as they are from time to time, a fixed policy always would be impracticable and impossible. He refers to two instances. He refers to the case of Colombia, and I infer from what he says that we ought to abide by the rape of that helpless nation and not undertake to make amends for the injustice which all the world recognizes as such. He lamented the fact that President Taft did not decide upon a fixed Mexican policy. I regret that he did not, for if he had done so I have no doubt that President Wilson would have carried that policy out. But this administration had to originate a policy with reference to the Mexican situation. It has been a successful one, and to-day the American people applaud President Wilson's course with relation to Mexican affairs. [Applause.] One thing which I regret more than another is that in times such as these, when the world is involved in war, the Members of this House can not sometimes get serious and forget partisan bias and give credit where credit belongs. To-day, and on every day, criticisms come from that side of the House—fault-finding and carping for political purposes and for political effect. And yet no man here volunteers a suggestion as to how conditions can be remedied or what policies would be better.

I am not the spokesman of the administration. I have no brief other than as a Democratic Member of this House to speak for the President or the Department of State. But I sometimes feel like coming to my feet and asking gentlemen to point out what there is in the management of our foreign affairs that could be improved and what changes they would make. I for one believe that Mr. Bryan is performing noble duties for his country, and that his department is being conducted as well as it ever was in the history of our country. With all the troubles that surround us, the complications which arise from day to day, gentlemen can not put their fingers upon a single act of the Department of State and criticize it—not one. They can not point to a single change which ought to be made; and if this administration continues as it has and gets through with the troubles that now involve the world without the United States becoming involved, the present Secretary of State will go into history as one of the greatest that ever exercised the functions of that high office. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does the gentleman think that the Santo Domingo incident is above criticism?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have not seen anything to seriously criticize in that. I will say that I rather commend or approve the Secretary of State in wishing in a proper way to provide for political friends, because in all that he has done in that direc-

tion he has never recommended or secured the appointment of any man who was not a good, capable, and suitable man for the position.

Now, may I ask gentlemen to grow serious for one moment? Forget that we are partisans, that there is a line here dividing this House, and upon that side sit partisan Republicans and upon this side sit partisan Democrats, and for one moment say to ourselves that we will give credit where credit is due. I will read an extract from a great newspaper, edited by a great editor, and I only wish that gentlemen here could sometimes grow as broad minded as the author of this article. It is entitled "The man of burdens," and is from the Chicago Herald of the 17th, a paper which never was Democratic. It is edited, as I have said, by a broad-minded, liberal man, who can sometimes forget partisan bias and pay tribute to one to whom tribute is due.

I read:

THE MAN OF BURDENS.

In these troubled times, when every day shows more clearly the dangers that confront even the most sincere neutrality, the hearts of all Americans should go out in sympathy and support to that solitary man sitting in the White House at Washington who carries the welfare of 100,000,000 people so largely in his hand.

His is a staggering responsibility. It is the greatest that could be laid on the chief executive of any nation in time of peace. No American since Lincoln has borne such a burden, has been confronted with issues which are so big with fate for the land we love.

It is easy for those who do not share his burden or realize its tremendous weight on heart and mind to say what ought to be done under any and all circumstances. But his is the solemn duty not only of saying, but also of acting; not only of acting but also of doing so with the knowledge that the welfare of his fellow citizens may hang upon his course.

Under such circumstances President Wilson needs the sympathy and support of every true American. He needs to know that political friends and foes alike are with him; that they know the burden he is carrying and believe that he will carry it—if with pain and labor to himself—with honor to the Nation.

He should be made to feel that there is from one end of the country to another an abiding faith in his integrity and singleness of purpose and in his absolute determination to walk with circumspection but directly to the goal, stepping aside neither in the spirit of truculence nor subservience.

He should be made to feel that partisanship and personal feeling wholly cease to have a meaning for Americans when their President is confronted with what may quickly develop into an international crisis of grave significance; that the whole moral force and the whole heart and the whole mind of the Nation are his to lean upon or to call upon for support.

And above all he should be made to feel that Americans understand how free from the taint of personal ambition and pride are his high-minded efforts to serve his country in these moments of its need for wise guidance; that it is of his country and not of himself he thinks first and last of all; that his one aim is to serve her and her alone.

Nothing that could be said or felt or done can avail to abate his high and solemn responsibility. But his way may and should be brightened by the knowledge that those for whom he stands and speaks and labors have confidence in his integrity, his ability, his singleness of purpose, and his zeal.

[Applause.]

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BROCKSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BROCKSON] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BROCKSON. Mr. Chairman, in the short time allotted to me I shall not discuss foreign affairs, but will bring to your attention some domestic affairs.

Lately we have heard much said here about the number of people in this country who are out of work. I am pleased to be able to inform the House that business conditions in the State which I have the honor to represent have been improving recently, and are still improving, notwithstanding the disturbance of business caused by the European war. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Some of the new business is shown by the newspaper articles which I will read.

The Evening Journal, of Wilmington, Del., of December 5, 1914, contains the following article:

HARLAN & HOLLINGSWORTH TO BUILD BIG FOREIGN STEAMER—LOCAL CORPORATION GETS CONTRACT FOR FREIGHT CARRIER 450 FEET IN LENGTH—ONE OF LARGEST EVER BUILT IN LOCAL YARD.

Announcement was made by the Harlan & Hollingsworth Corporation to-day that it had just signed a contract for a large steamship.

The vessel will be 450 feet long, and one of the largest, if not the largest, ever constructed in Wilmington.

It will be a freight steamship, and is to be constructed pursuant to an order received from a foreign country.

Just for whom the steamship will be built is not announced. The Harlan & Hollingsworth officials stated that work has been started on preliminary details, but actual construction may not be started for a month.

The Wilmington Morning News, of Wilmington, Del., of February 16, 1915, contains the following article:

HARLAN & HOLLINGSWORTH CORPORATION GETS ANOTHER CONTRACT—LONDON PETROLEUM CONCERN DUPLICATES ORDER FOR SHIPS.

The Anglo-Saxon Petroleum Co., of London, England, that recently placed an order for the construction of a freight steamer 450 feet long with the Harlan & Hollingsworth Corporation, has duplicated the order. It was said yesterday, and where the company was to build one ship it will now build two.

The Wilmington Morning News, of Wilmington, Del., issued to-day, contains the following article:

HARLAN & HOLLINGSWORTH CORPORATION GETS ANOTHER CONTRACT—TO BUILD FERRYBOAT AND STEEL PASSENGER COACHES.

Information was given out at the offices of the Harlan & Hollingsworth Corporation yesterday that they have succeeded in securing a contract for the building of the hull of a large steel ferryboat for the Fort Lee Ferry Co., of New York. The vessel will be 200 feet in length and 61 feet in breadth of beam. It is to have a carrying capacity of 1,200 persons, and will be fitted with all the latest modern accommodations, together with a strictly fireproof equipment, conforming to all rules regulating safety required at sea. She will be used for traffic between Riverside, N. Y., and Edge Water Park, N. J.

Announcement was also made of the contract secured from the Philadelphia & Reading Railroad for the construction of 10 all-steel coaches. The cars will be 70 feet in length, and they will be completed as soon as possible.

These two contracts, coupled with the contract for the two large tank steamers which are to be built for the Anglo-Saxon Petroleum Co., of London, England, and several minor contracts, will mean a revival of old-time activity at the plant. It is thought by the opening of spring the concern will be working on full time, with their full quota of men. It was learned that the keel of the first tanker had been already laid and that preparations for the second one are now going on, the material arriving yesterday.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Delaware has expired.

Mr. BROCKSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] that he has 24 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] has 14 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the remarks of the gentleman who has just left the floor [Mr. BROCKSON] with a great deal of interest. The news that he has read has suggested to my mind a few queries.

First, I have wondered whether this was a "psychological" recovery from a "psychological depression." I have been wondering if we have had no bad times, as our friends on the other side have been claiming for the past year, how it happens that they were improving.

But the one question that suggested itself most pointedly to my mind was this: It seems that this shipyard referred to by the gentleman from Delaware is now constructing foreign ships for the foreign trade, for the freight trade; the very character of vessels that are proposed to be purchased under the terms of the bill that we passed the other day.

Now, if the foreigner can come into our shipyards and have his vessels constructed, where is the necessity of our giving authority to a shipping board to go forth and purchase foreign ships? If the foreigners have ships for sale, why are they here in our yards ordering vessels to be constructed? What becomes of the argument that we have been hearing, that we must have the privilege of going out and purchasing foreign ships to get them under the American flag?

I could not help thinking, when the gentleman from Delaware was telling about the conditions that had been improved, of the argument that we have so frequently heard to the effect that the European war has brought upon the country the great business depression that we are now suffering from. The revival of which the gentleman speaks is mostly due to foreign orders. It seems that the war has acted to a certain extent as a protective tariff. It has caused the foreigner to sell us less and to buy of us more. It is giving some work to our own people. I hope when the gentleman gives us a statement the next time about prosperity he will show us something that is being revived in our domestic industries not due to the war.

Mr. BROCKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington yield to the gentleman from Delaware?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have only three minutes.

Mr. BROCKSON. Well, I know; but I want to correct the gentleman's statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If the gentleman can correct it in a minute, all right.

Mr. BROCKSON. Only two boats are to be used in the foreign trade. The other boat is to be used in New York, and the cars are intended for domestic trade entirely.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I understood the gentleman to say that some of the cars were for the foreign trade.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] to use some of his time. We will probably have but one speech on this side.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman says "probably." Will you or will you not have but one speech on your side? It ought not to be difficult to determine that.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I am not positive.

Mr. COOPER. I will ask the gentleman why not? Why can not the gentleman determine?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Because I have not made up my mind. It is a question between two gentlemen, as to whether one shall have all the time or divide it between the two.

The CHAIRMAN. Do the gentlemen want all the time to be taken out of their time equally?

Mr. COOPER. This is not debate. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, in view of some recent events, I want to discuss in the time allotted to me the question of the relations between the President and Congress.

Under the Constitution the President has the right to recommend to Congress such measures as he deems proper, and he also has the right to veto any measure that may be passed by Congress that he deems unwise, and in both of these rights he can not and ought not to be interfered with. In other words, the President has the right to recommend any legislation that he may desire, and he may also veto any bill that may be passed by the Congress and without assigning any reason for his action.

I do not believe, however, that the Constitution contemplated that the President should have the right to influence the legislative body to the extent that on many occasions Executive influence has been exercised, and we have very recently had an illustration of such influence both with relation to the passage of a bill and also with relation to a veto message that, in my opinion, violates the spirit of the Constitution, and if the tendency that has gradually been growing up in the last few years for the President to dictate, if not dominate, the Congress is not discontinued the time will soon come when one of the great political parties of this country will declare against what will be termed "Executive interference," and the people will indorse the party that makes such a declaration.

Within a very few days the present Congress passed the immigration bill. It was sent to the President, and after considering it for a number of days, in his wisdom, using his discretion and the power given him by the Constitution, he saw fit to veto the bill, and he had a right to veto it if it did not meet with his approval. There, in my judgment, his responsibility in relation to the measure ceased. The bill had passed the House by a vote of 252 to 126, or by a vote of 2 to 1. It went to the Senate. It passed that body by a vote of 50 to 7. The bill then went to conference, and when the conference report was adopted in the House the vote was 227 to 94. So it appears beyond any question that a two-thirds majority of the House and a 7 to 1 majority of the other body was in favor of the legislation.

Notwithstanding the vote in the House upon the bill and the conference report, when the vote was taken upon the passage of the bill over the veto of the President it failed to receive the necessary two-thirds majority, due to the change of several Members on that side of the Chamber who voted to sustain the veto when only a few days before they were recorded for the passage of the measure.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe anyone will deny that except for the influence of the Executive the bill would have passed this House, the veto of the President to the contrary notwithstanding. I do not believe there is anyone on either side of the House who will assert that in his opinion the veto would have been sustained had it not been for the influence of the administration.

In vetoing the immigration bill the President in his message said:

Its enactment into law would undoubtedly enhance the efficiency and improve the methods of handling the important branch of the public service to which it relates. But candor and a sense of duty with regard to the responsibilities so clearly imposed upon me by the Constitution in matters of legislation leave me no choice but to dissent.

This was a sufficient statement to explain why he could not approve the measure, and it would seem as if a Member of Congress ought to be permitted to vote his conviction upon any question when convinced that "candor and a sense of duty with regard to the responsibilities so clearly imposed * * * by the Constitution" impel him to do so.

He ought to be left to discharge his obligation without such influence from the Executive as might be exercised, in view of the great power that the President possesses, and he ought not to be criticized if his position is not in accord with the opinion of the President.

I want to refer to the shipping bill that was passed by the House the other day. The President, in his message delivered in this Chamber at a joint session of the Senate and House on the 8th day of December, in accordance with his power under the Constitution, urged the Congress to enact into law the then pending shipping bill. That was entirely within the functions of his high office. I do not wish to be understood as saying that the President ought not to take any interest in measures that he may recommend to Congress, because that would be going further than I wish to go. But I do say that the Executive ought not to use the power that he has, as it was used on this shipping bill and with relation to the veto of the immigration bill, and that such use is a violation of the power conferred by the Constitution upon the President with relation to legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the shipping bill that we passed on Tuesday was not the pending bill that the President referred to in his message on December 8. It was a bill originating outside of the House, prepared and brought here, but not introduced. It came into the House under a special rule reported by the Committee on Rules, making it in order as an amendment to a bill that had passed the Senate and was pending before the Committee on Naval Affairs, and which had not had any consideration by that committee; the rule discharged the Committee on Naval Affairs from the consideration of the bill and directed that it be reported to the House with the shipping bill added to it as an amendment, though the amendment was not germane to the Senate bill. The rule provided that after six hours of general debate the previous question should be ordered and the bill placed upon its passage without being read, so that its different provisions could be discussed under the usual five-minute rule, and without any opportunity to offer amendments, and under that gag rule it was jammed through the House. This action is another evidence of Democratic inconsistency, because for a number of years before they got control of this House they were protesting against gag rule, and made it an issue in the campaigns. I wonder what some of them will say to their constituents if they are questioned with reference to their action in voting, as most of them did, for the rule that was adopted in connection with the ship-purchase bill. I might remind them that in their platform of 1908 they declared that under the Republican Party the House of Representatives "has ceased to be a deliberative body." In their platform of 1912, boasting of what their party had accomplished, they said:

It has, among other achievements, revised the rules of the House of Representatives so as to give to the representatives of the American people freedom of speech and action in advocating, proposing, and perfecting remedial legislation.

The adoption of the rule on the ship-purchase bill is only following many other gag rules that have been adopted by this and the preceding Congress that in their drastic provisions exceed by far anything that the Republicans were ever accused of.

Mr. Chairman, no one now will dispute that the ship-purchase bill is the President's bill. It was admitted in the debate, in speech, and in verse; it was stated by the distinguished Speaker of the House in a caucus of his party during the late hours of the night immediately preceding the day when the bill was passed, if we can believe what we read in the newspapers, that it was the bill of the President; that it was the President's desire that the bill be passed; in fact, that he was insisting upon its passage, notwithstanding that a clear majority of the Members of this body, if they had voted their honest convictions, were against it; it was jammed, as I have already stated, through the House.

And how was it done, Mr. Chairman? To a large extent it was done in the same manner that the veto message on the immigration bill was sustained when it was considered by the House. A representative of the administration, one of his immediate official family, and the same one in both instances, appeared at the Capitol and was very much in evidence lobbying with the Democratic Members of the House, urging them to support the wishes of the President. And why was that particular member of the Cabinet—the Postmaster General—selected to lobby with the Members in both of these cases? It is perfectly apparent why he was selected. It was because he happens to have the ear of corn. [Laughter on the Republican side.] In other words, the Democratic Members saw post-office appointments in their different districts dangling before them, and they evidently believed that if they wished to have their way

with relation to these appointments it would probably be policy on their part to do the will of the administration.

We have heard a good deal since this administration came into power about lobbying and lobbyists, but there is no influence upon legislation that is more pernicious than a Cabinet official who has much patronage to dispense using his influence with the Members of Congress upon pending measures. That this has been done by the present Postmaster General both as to the veto of the President on the immigration bill and with reference to the ship-purchase bill can not be denied.

Why, Mr. Chairman, the morning after the caucus, and the day on which the shipping bill was considered, it was currently reported that the Postmaster General had communicated with somebody in the House, wanting a list of the names of the members of the Democratic Party who had stated that they would not abide by the action of the caucus of the night before. Now, I do not know whether he made that inquiry or not, but if he did, what was the significance of it? Certainly it could have but one significance, and that would be the effect that it might have upon the Members on that side of the Chamber.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I had more time to discuss this question. I want to read as a part of my remarks excerpts from two speeches, one by the lamented Abraham Lincoln at Pittsburgh on February 15, 1861, another by Stephen A. Douglas at Alton, Ill., October 15, 1858, which speeches were published upon the editorial page of the New York Sun recently, both dealing with the subject of the President and Congress. I commend the same to the Members of the House.

[From Abraham Lincoln's address at Pittsburgh, Feb. 15, 1861.]

By the Constitution the Executive may recommend measures which he may think proper and he may veto those he thinks improper, and it is supposed that he may add to these certain indirect influences to affect the action of Congress. My political education strongly inclines me against a very free use of any of these means by the Executive to control the legislation of the country. As a rule, I think it better that Congress should originate as well as perfect its measures without external bias.

[From Stephen A. Douglas's opening speech at Alton, Oct. 15, 1858.]

And now this warfare is made on me [by Mr. Buchanan] because I would not surrender my convictions of duty, because I would not abandon my constituency and receive the orders of the Executive authorities how I should vote in the Senate of the United States. I hold that an attempt to control the Senate on the part of the Executive is subversive of the Constitution. The executive department is independent of the Senate and the Senate is independent of the Executive. * * * Whenever you recognize the right of the Executive to say to a Senator, "Do this or I will take off the heads of your friends," you convert this Government from a Republic into a despotism. Whenever you recognize the right of a President to say to a Member of Congress, "Vote as I tell you or I will bring a power to bear against you that will crush you," you destroy the independence of the Representative and convert him into a tool of Executive power.

Mr. Chairman, I am an optimist. I am always looking for the good that there is in everything. I have seen some good come out of this outrageous, high-handed proceeding that took place here two or three days ago in connection with the shipping bill. It is reported by the newspapers that the distinguished Speaker in the Democratic caucus the night before the bill was passed made the statement that a special session of Congress meant disaster and defeat to the Democratic Party. Here is what the Speaker is alleged to have said:

The House should do everything possible to expedite action and avoid an extra session. If there is an extra session, the Democratic Party will be wiped off the face of the earth at the next election.

At that time it looked as if a special session was inevitable, but we now understand that it is not being considered and that there is no intention of any special session of the Sixty-fourth Congress. So that much good has come out of the passage by the House of the ship-purchase bill, and the Speaker, who went so far as to help the administration out of a bad situation by aiding in getting his party associates to vote for the bill, has indeed rendered to the country a most valuable service if his prophecy of the effect of a special session has resulted in abandoning that idea. Another good that came out of the passage of the shipping bill was that it afforded a question upon which the Republican Members of the House for the first time during this Congress were able to vote as a unit, and it was extremely gratifying to me, as I am about to retire to private life, that at last the Republicans are united and that they had the support of a majority of the Progressive Members of the House, which, Mr. Chairman, assures in 1916 Republican success and a return to the prosperity that will come to the country as it has on every other occasion when that party is in control of the affairs of the Nation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. GUERNSEY] was to occupy some time, but inasmuch as he is not here I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. GUERNSEY] have leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BROCKSON] gave some figures about the improvement of the industries on the Atlantic coast. Since that time I have felt in my pocket, and have found there some figures that show the conditions on the Pacific.

A few days ago the House of Representatives of the State of Washington passed a resolution, by a vote of 74 to 20, asking the repeal of the Underwood tariff law. They gave some figures to show some of the reasons why. I quote from the resolution figures giving the increases in imports into the State of Washington for the year 1914:

The importation of butter increased from 12,008 to 1,104,000 pounds; eggs from 4,755 to 289,000 dozen; fresh beef from 145,891 to 3,453,000 pounds; hogs from 5 head to 98,000; salmon from 759,362 to 3,000,000; lumber from 434,000 to 12,026,000 feet; shingles from 44,276,000 to 235,000,000.

All that represents that much work and wages that have been taken from the laborer in Washington and given to the foreigner. Not a single one of the articles is selling for a cent less than when the Underwood tariff bill went into effect.

Last night I had the pleasure of attending a banquet in New York, given by the American Pulp and Paper Association, and the facts developed there that there is not a single newspaper on Puget Sound that is using a pound of paper manufactured in the United States. Before the Underwood tariff law went into effect every pound of paper used there was manufactured in the State of Washington. The paper then used represented a pay roll of \$150,000 a month, and every cent of that has been transferred from the State of Washington to British Columbia. The Underwood tariff law has destroyed the pulp business of Puget Sound as completely as a conflagration. But the people pay the same for the newspapers that they paid before. That is some of the prosperity that we are suffering under on Puget Sound as the result of the Underwood tariff law, and we do not believe that it is psychological or entirely a state of mind. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I have here in my hand another matter, an order issued by the Postmaster General, reducing the salary of letter collectors \$200 a year. What is the reason for that? What is the use of reducing the wages throughout the country in this time of the return of prosperity. Also in his report he requests that the eight-hour law be repealed in order that these letter carriers can do more work. That does not look like a period of general prosperity. Is that the reason that we have the general reduction of hours and wages? Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I understand that I have three minutes left.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TAGGART].

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Chairman, it was my purpose to make a few observations on our foreign relations, but on account of the shortness of time I am unable to address myself properly to that subject.

I am very much interested in the fact that the State Legislature of Washington took occasion to pass a resolution with reference to the repeal of the Underwood tariff law. I have no doubt but that there are many phases of the law that may not be to the best interests of all the people of the State of Washington. But I will take this occasion to call attention to another resolution that was passed by a Republican house of representatives in the State of Kansas. Kansas Republicans are nothing if not eloquent. The house of representatives of Kansas consists of a large majority of Republicans—66 Republicans against 49 Democrats, 9 Progressives, and 1 Socialist, constituting the 125 members of the lower house of the most prosperous State in the Union. This is what they said:

House resolution No. 33.

Whereas the Old World is now a theater of war and blood, more appalling than any picture to be found in all the past history of the civilization; and
Whereas the United States forms a striking contrast to these warring nations, being a land of happiness, prosperity, and contentment, her people nobly following peaceful pursuits, and out of her generosity and abounding love for humanity sending her fair daughters to relieve the suffering of the wounded and dying, and immense cargoes from her abundant stores to save the lives of the unfortunate victims of this world's catastrophe: Therefore be it

Resolved, First. That we extend to the Hon. Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, and his able advisers, our grateful and heartfelt thanks for having preserved the peace of our country and kept us out of this maelstrom of human destruction.

Resolved, Second. That we pledge to the President our united support in any and all honorable means that he may deem necessary to preserve the peace and dignity of our country and to bring about peace among the people and nations of the world.

Resolved, Third. That a copy of this resolution, signed by our speaker and certified by our chief clerk, be sent to the President of the United States and to each of our Members in Congress.

I hereby certify that the above resolution originated in the house, and passed that body.

Adopted February 15, 1915.

ROBERT STONE,
Speaker of the House.
I. E. LAMBERT,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE].

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I want to refer, in the first place, to a statement made by my good friend from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE] with reference to the passage of several bills under what he denominates "compulsion and gag rule" in this House, and the anticipated punishment by the Postmaster General of those men who refuse to be bound by the caucus.

Since the statement has been made by my friend from South Dakota I have taken occasion to inquire of three or four gentlemen in the cloakroom, who had reserved the right not to be bound by the caucus action on the shipping bill, as to whether Mr. Burleson or any other official had interviewed them with reference to their position on the immigration bill or on the shipping bill, and I found that neither of these gentlemen were interviewed by the Postmaster General or anyone in his behalf. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I also find that it is properly within the province of the minority to criticize the majority in its legislation. The majority, Mr. Chairman, is responsible for the legislation always, and at no time in the history of the country in recent years has any party been so ready to accept the responsibility of standing for the legislation that has taken place in the Sixty-third Congress as we are. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I know that my friend from South Dakota is addicted to the general habit that a great many good Republicans are in the matter of prophecy. In 1909 I heard the gentlemen on that side say the Republicans in 1910 would sweep the country in the election. In 1911 I got the same prophecy as to what they were going to do in 1912. In 1913 I heard the same statement as to what the country would do to the Democratic Party in 1914, and I expect, Mr. Chairman, to hear this year the same kind of talk as to what the Republican Party is going to do in 1916, and with the same result. The average ordinary Republican is as full of forecasts as the Weather Bureau, and not half as reliable. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I want to take occasion here to differ from my good friend from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] in reference to his theory of how the Government ought to be conducted. If I understood the gentleman correctly, it was that in the standardization of consuls of the United States, and in placing all of the administration officers under the civil service in the different departments of Government, we ought to establish a fixed and definite policy that should continue through the administrations that shall come after us. I do not think my friend means to say that. In this Republic, made up of parties to which the people appeal for a change of policy whenever in their opinion it ought to be made, that condition could not be effective.

Mr. CAMPBELL rose.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I beg the gentleman's pardon, but I have only a few minutes left.

Mr. CAMPBELL. But right on that proposition.

Mr. CLINE. The gentleman undertook to say that there should be no change in the offices held by the administration forces of the Government, except the Presidency and the secretaries of his Cabinet, and that all of the other officers—

Mr. CAMPBELL. Oh, the gentleman should quote me correctly. I was referring to the foreign service entirely. I make a distinction between our domestic policy and our foreign policy.

Mr. CLINE. The gentleman says that he was talking about the foreign service. The consuls in the foreign service do not affect our policy. Those policies are affected by our ministers and not by the consuls, who are the especial business agents of the United States, and they have nothing to do with the policies of the country. They are representing our business abroad and not the policy of any party.

The man that fixes the policy of the party is the titular head of the party, the President, represented through his Secretaries and other administration officers. The consuls have been put

into the classified service, into a standardized service, for the purpose of maintaining some regularity in their appointment and in the offices the duties of which they are to perform. But, Mr. Chairman, that could not possibly affect the policy of a party, and in a Republic the policies of the different parties are as distinct as it is important they should be. The policy and theory of the Democratic Party are as absolutely distinct from those of the Republican Party as it is possible to make them.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is the foreign policy of the Democratic Party as distinguished from the foreign policy of the Republican Party?

Mr. CLINE. The gentleman will excuse me, when I have only one or two minutes of time. I do not want him to take that away from me. I will say to the gentleman one thing—that the foreign policy of the Democratic Party is a policy of absolute neutrality and universal peace. [Applause.] We are proceeding with the head of the party to establish those relations upon strictly and absolutely neutral grounds.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Was that the policy of the Democratic Party when you went down and took Vera Cruz last April?

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to another matter in this discussion. My good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] has undertaken, as several gentlemen have recently, to criticize Mr. Bryan with reference to the writing of the Vick letter. To use an everyday expression, it is a cold day when the administration is not criticized with reference to this Santo Domingo incident. Mr. Bryan assumed, however violent the assumption may have been, that even under this administration a good and deserving Democrat might be recognized when he could discharge the duties as well as a Republican and an opportunity arose to appoint him. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have no authority to speak for Mr. Bryan, other than as a Democrat to defend a man unjustly attacked when he is absent and to unqualifiedly indorse his actions in the San Domingo incident. It may be sufficient to say that through the appointment of the minister now representing this Government there that Mr. Bryan has established a stable and respectable government and wiped out some reprehensible methods.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLINE. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is a short question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, a short time ago I sent to the State Department and asked it to send to me a list of all the men that had been appointed, transferred, or promoted under the Consular Service from March 4, 1909, to the 20th of January, 1912. I shall not have time to read it at this time, but I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend it in my remarks by including this list.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend the letter from the State Department in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

Appointments, transfers, and promotions in the Consular Service Mar. 4, 1909, to Dec. 20, 1912.

[Italic entries indicate post held Mar. 4, 1909.]

Name and home address.	Post.	Salary.	Date.
Alger, William E., Boston, Mass.	Consul, Tegucigalpa.....	\$2,500	Nov. 10, 1904
	Consul, Puerto Cortes.....	2,500	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Mazatlan.....	2,500	Dec. 16, 1909
Anderson, George E., Springfield, Ill.	Consul general, Rio de Janeiro	8,000	Feb. 13, 1906
	Consul general, Hongkong....	8,000	May 4, 1910
Arnold, Julian H., Sacramento, Cal.	Consul, Amoy.....	4,500	May 1, 1908
	Consul, Chefoo.....	4,500	Mar. 8, 1912
Baker, E. Carleton, Alameda, Cal.	Consul, Antung.....	2,500	Nov. 10, 1909
	Consul, Chungking.....	3,500	Aug. 19, 1911
Baker, Henry D., Chicago, Ill.	Consul, Hobart.....	2,000	Aug. 15, 1907
	Consul, Nassau.....	3,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Baugh, Hubert G., Petaluma, Cal.	Interpreter, Hankow.....	1,500	Feb. 17, 1909
	Interpreter, Mukden.....	1,500	Dec. 16, 1910
	Interpreter, Tientsin.....	1,500	Feb. 24, 1911
	Consul, Saigon.....	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, St. Pierre.....	2,000	Apr. 9, 1912
Baxter, John K., Nashville, Tenn.			
Bergh, Robert S. S., Grand Forks, N. D.	Consul, Belgrade.....	3,000	June 10, 1908
	Consul, Burslem.....	3,000	Dec. 20, 1911
Bergholz, Leo Allen, New York, N. Y.	Consul general, Canton.....	5,500	May 25, 1906
	Consul, Kingston, Jamaica....	4,500	Aug. 22, 1912
Bireh, David R., Philadelphia, Pa.	Consul, Alexandria.....	3,500	June 10, 1908
	Consul, Bahia.....	4,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Blake, Maxwell, Kansas City, Mo.	Consul, Dunfermline.....	3,000	Dec. 21, 1907
	Consul general, Bogota.....	3,500	Jan. 11, 1910
	Consul general, Tangier.....	3,500	Dec. 14, 1910
Bond, Wallace C., Cheyenne, Wyo.	Consul, Karachi.....	3,000	June 10, 1908
	Consul general, Copenhagen, resigned Jan. 1, 1911.	3,000	Aug. 27, 1909
Bonney, Wilbert L., Chicago, Ill.	Consul, San Luis Potosi.....	2,500	June 24, 1910

Appointments, transfers, and promotions, etc.—Continued.

Name and home address.	Post.	Salary.	Date.
Bray, John P., Grand Forks, N. Dak.	Consul general, Sydney, Australia.	\$5,500	June 10, 1908
Brett, Homer, Meridian, Miss.	Consul, Manchester.	6,000	(¹)
Brickwood, Jr., Albert W., Nogales, Ariz.	Consul, Maskat.	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
Bucklin, Jr., George A., Norman, Okla.	Consul, Puerto Cortes.	2,500	Aug. 17, 1908
Busser, Ralph C., Philadelphia, Pa.	Consul, Tapachula, resigned Mar. 1, 1912.	2,000	May 31, 1909
Byington, Homer M., Norwalk, Conn.	Consul, San Luis Potosi.	2,500	June 10, 1908
Caughy, Charles M., Baltimore, Md.	Consul general, Guatemala.	3,500	June 24, 1910
Cauldwell, Frederic W., Washington, D. C.	Consul, Erfurt.	2,500	May 31, 1909
Chamberlain, George A., Captain, N. Mex.	Consul assistant.	1,800	July 1, 1908
Chamberlain, George E., Ouronta, N. Y.	Consul, Bristol.	2,000	May 31, 1909
Chase, Benjamin F., Clearfield, Pa.	Consul, Malaga.	3,000	Apr. 29, 1907
Cheshire, Fleming D., Brooklyn, N. Y.	Consul, Milan, resigned Dec. 1912.	4,000	May 31, 1909
Clare, Arthur J., District of Columbia.	Consul assistant.	1,800	July 1, 1908
Cloud, Frederick D., Des Moines, Iowa.	Consul, Tapachula.	2,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Clum, Harold D., Saugerties, N. Y.	Consul, Pernambuco.	4,000	June 22, 1908
Coffin, Henry P., Philadelphia, Pa.	Consul, Lourenco Marques.	5,000	May 31, 1909
Coffin, William, Middleboro, Ky.	Consul, Swatow.	2,500	Jan. 10, 1910
Conner, Jacob E., Mount Pleasant, Iowa.	Consul, Cork.	2,500	June 24, 1910
Cooke, Arthur B., Spartansburg, S. C.	Consul, Leeds.	2,500	May 31, 1909
Crane, Robert T., Baltimore, Md.	Consul general at large.	5,000	May 24, 1908
Culver, Henry S., Delaware, Ohio.	Consul general, Canton.	5,500	Aug. 22, 1912
Cunningham, Edwin S., Maryville, Tenn.	Consul, Georgetown.	3,500	June 10, 1908
Damm, Henry C. A., Seawane, Tenn.	Consul, Bluefields.	3,500	Jan. 21, 1911
Daniels, Charles N., Williamantic, Conn.	Consul, Antung.	2,500	June 22, 1908
Davis, George F., Richmond, Mo.	Vice and deputy consul general in charge at Mukden. Reappointed consul, Antung, resigned Jan., 1910.	2,500	Nov. 1, 1909
Davis, Leslie A., Port Jefferson, N. Y.	Consul, Ceiba.	2,000	Mar. 13, 1912
Dawson, Claude I., Anderson, S. C.	Consul, Mazatlan.	2,500	June 2, 1909
Dawson, William, Jr., St. Paul, Minn.	Consul, Rosario.	2,500	Dec. 16, 1909
Denby, Charles, Evansville, Ind.	Consul, Mosatlan.	2,500	June 2, 1909
De Soto, Hernando, California.	Consul, Riga.	3,000	Dec. 10, 1910
Deedmeyer, Frank, Birmingham, Ala.	Consul, Cornwall.	2,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Deichman, Carl F., St. Louis, Mo.	Consul, Stettin.	2,500	May 31, 1909
Dennison E. Haldeman, Columbus, Ohio.	Consul, Sheffield.	3,000	Apr. 9, 1912
Donegan, Alfred W., Mobile, Ala.	Consul, Sherbrooke.	3,500	Sept. 25, 1908
Dorsey, W. Roderick, Baltimore, Md.	Consul, Ceiba.	2,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Doty, William F., Princeton, N. J.	Consul, Batum.	2,500	Mar. 13, 1912
Dreher, Julius D., Selwood, S. C.	Consul, Puerto Cortes.	2,500	June 24, 1910
Du Bois, James T., Hallstead, Pa.	Consul, Valencia.	2,500	Aug. 22, 1912
Dumont, Frederick T. F., Lancaster, Pa.	Consul, Sierra Leone.	2,000	(¹)
Dunning, James E., Portland, Me.	Consul general, Shanghai.	8,000	Apr. 15, 1907
Dye, Alexander V., Liberty, Mo.	Consul general, Vienna.	6,000	May 17, 1909
Dye, John W., Winona, Minn.	Consul, Riga.	3,000	June 10, 1908
Eberhardt, Charles C., Salina, Kans.	Consul, Palermo.	3,500	June 24, 1910
Edwards, Clement S., Albert Lea, Minn.	Consul, Charlotte.	2,000	May 31, 1909
Ferris, Cornelius, Jr., Denver, Colo.	Consul, Leghorn.	3,000	Aug. 19, 1911
Fisher, Fred D., Albany, Oreg.	Consul, Tamsui.	3,000	May 4, 1908
Forman, Charles, New Orleans, La.	Consul, Nagasaki.	3,500	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Bombay.	4,000	June 22, 1908
	Consul, Dundee.	4,000	Dec. 19, 1910
	Consular assistant.	1,800	June 24, 1908
	Consul, Madgeburg.	2,500	June 24, 1910
	Consul, Jerez de la Frontera.	2,500	Aug. 22, 1912
	Consul, Tabriz.	3,000	June 22, 1908
	Consul, Riga.	3,000	June 24, 1910
	Consul, Tahiti.	2,000	Aug. 2, 1908
	Consul, Port Antonio.	3,000	June 24, 1910
	Consul general, Singapore.	4,500	Apr. 5, 1909
	Envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Colombia.	10,000	Aug. 21, 1911
	Consul, Guadeloupe.	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Madrid.	2,500	Aug. 22, 1912
	Consul, Milan.	4,000	Apr. 11, 1905
	Consul, Havre.	5,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul general at large.	5,000	Aug. 22, 1912
	Consul, Nogales.	2,500	May 31, 1909
	Resigned Jan. 1, 1913.		
	Consular assistant.	1,800	July 1, 1908
	Consul, St. Johns, Quebec.	2,000	(¹)
	Consul, Barranquilla.	3,500	May 1, 1908
	Consul general at large.	5,000	Jan. 12, 1910
	Consul, Acapulco.	2,500	Mar. 2, 1911
	Consul, Asuncion.	2,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Malta.	2,500	(¹)
	Consul, Neuquien.	4,500	Jan. 21, 1909
	Consul general, Mukden.	4,000	Aug. 27, 1909
	Consul, Turks Island.	2,000	Aug. 23, 1912

¹ Nomination pending.

Appointments, transfers, and promotions, etc.—Continued.

Name and home address.	Post.	Salary.	Date.
Foster, Paul H., Houston, Tex.	Consul, Teneriffe.	\$2,500	Nomination pending.
Fowler, John, Winchester, Mass.	Consul, Chefoo.	4,500	June 10, 1908
Frazer, Robert, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.	Consul, Foochow.	4,500	Mar. 13, 1912
Freeman, Charles M., Hillsboro Bridge, N. H.	Consul, Valencia.	2,500	July 16, 1909
Frost, Wesley, Berea, Ky.	Consul, Malaga.	3,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Fuller, Stuart J., Madison, Wis.	Consul, Durango.	2,000	Mar. 30, 1907
Gale, William H., Leesburg, Va.	Consul, Sydney, Nova Scotia.	3,000	Aug. 19, 1911
Gard, Allen, Orange, N. J.	Consul, Charlottetown.	2,000	Apr. 5, 1912
Garrels, Arthur, St. Louis, Mo.	Consul, Goteborg.	2,500	July 29, 1909
Gasset, Percival, Washington, D. C.	Consul, Iquitos.	3,000	Apr. 11, 1912
Gaulin, Alphonse, Woonsocket, R. I.	Consul, Malta.	2,500	Dec. 21, 1907
Gracey, Wilbur T., Boston, Mass.	Consul general, Athens.	3,000	Jan. 11, 1910
Greene, Roger S., Cambridge, Mass.	Consul, Ceiba.	2,000	Aug. 2, 1910
Griffith, P. Merrill, Sabina, Ohio.	Consul, Charlottetown; died Oct. 27, 1911.	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
Griffiths, John L., Indianapolis, Ind.	Consul, Zanzibar.	2,500	June 22, 1908
Guenther, Richard, Oshkosh, Wis.	Consul, Catania.	3,000	Jan. 11, 1910
Guyant, Claude E., Decatur, Ill.	Consul, Alexandria.	3,500	Aug. 22, 1912
Haebler, Arminius T., St. Louis, Mo.	Consul, Jerez de la Frontera.	2,500	June 10, 1908
Hale, Franklin D., Lunenburg, Vt.	Consul, Iquique.	3,000	Apr. 15, 1912
Hamm, Theodore C., Bancroft, Va.	Consul, Havre.	5,000	Mar. 8, 1905
Hamm, Walter C., Philadelphia, Pa.	Consul general, Marseille.	5,500	May 31, 1909
Handley, William W., Brooklyn, N. Y.	Consul, Tsingtau.	4,000	June 22, 1908
Hanna, Rea, Berkeley, Cal.	Consul, Nanking.	4,000	Apr. 15, 1910
Hannah, Frank S., Evanston, Ill.	Consul, Progreso.	3,000	Mar. 13, 1912
Hanson, George M., Ogden, Utah.	Consul, Harbin.	4,000	Jan. 21, 1909
Harris, Ernest L., Rock Island, Ill.	Consul general, Hankow.	4,500	Aug. 19, 1911
Harris, Heaton W., Alliance, Ohio.	Consul, Tampico.	5,000	Aug. 15, 1907
Haskell, Lewis W., Columbia, S. C.	Consul, Pernambuco.	4,000	Jan. 10, 1910
Hathaway, Charles M., Jr., Olyphant, Pa.	Consul general, Callao.	4,500	Nomination pending.
Hays, Perry C., Great Falls, Mont.	Consul, Liverpool.	8,000	Mar. 8, 1905
Heingartner, Alexander, New Philadelphia, Ohio.	Consul general, London.	12,000	May 31, 1909
Heintzleman, Percival, Fayetteville, Pa.	Consul general, Frankfurt.	5,500	Nov. 11, 1898
Henry, Frank Anderson, Wilmington, Del.	Consul general Cape Town.	6,000	May 4, 1910
Hill, Frank D., Pine Island, Minn.	Consul, Salina Cruz.	2,000	Mar. 8, 1912
Holder, Charles A., Colorado Springs, Colo.	Consul, Ensenada.	2,000	(¹)
Holland, Philip E., Jackson, Tenn.	Consul, Manzanillo.	2,000	June 10, 1908
Hollis, W. Stanley, Boston, Mass.	Consul, Tegucigalpa.	2,500	Jan. 11, 1910
Hoover, Charles L., Bolivar, Mo.	Consul, Vladivostok.	3,500	(¹)
Horton, George, Chicago, Ill.	Consul, Charlottetown.	2,000	May 1, 1908
Hurst, Carl Bailey, Washington, D. C.	Consul, Trinidad.	3,000	May 31, 1909
Ingram, Augustus E., Los Angeles, Cal.	Consul, Huddersfield.	3,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Jenkins, Douglas, Greenville, S. C.	Consul, Durango.	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
Jewell, John F., Galena, Ill.	Consul, Hull.	2,500	July 18, 1903
Jewett, Milo A., Danvers, Mass.	Consul, Newcastle-on-Tyne.	3,000	Feb. 12, 1912
	Consul general, Boma.	4,500	June 22, 1908
	Consul, Naples.	4,000	Dec. 14, 1910
	Consul, Iquique.	5,000	Aug. 15, 1907
	Consul, Georgetown.	3,500	Dec. 20, 1911
	Consul, Magdeburg.	2,500	July 21, 1904
	Consul, Kehl, resigned Aug. 31, 1911.	3,000	June 24, 1910
	Consul, Hobart.	2,000	Aug. 23, 1912
	Consul general, Smyrna.	5,500	June 10, 1908
	Consul general, Stockholm.	3,500	Jan. 20, 1911
	Consul general at large.	5,000	Jan. 25, 1909
	Consul general, Frankfurt on the Main.	5,500	Aug. 22, 1912
	Consul, Salina Cruz.	2,000	Jan. 11, 1910
	Consul, Hull.	2,500	Feb. 26, 1912
	Consul, Puerto Plata.	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Zanzibar.	2,500	Aug. 23, 1912
	Consul, Batum.	2,500	June 10, 1908
	Consul, Liege.	3,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Chungking.	5,000	Jan. 22, 1909
	Department of State.		Aug. 31, 1909
	Consul, Dalny.	3,500	June 24, 1910
	Second secretary, legation, Peking.	1,800	Aug. 16, 1910
	Assistant chief, Division of Far Eastern Affairs.	3,000	June 27, 1911
	Consul, Guadeloupe.	2,000	Aug. 23, 1912
	Consul general, Barcelona.	5,500	Mar. 10, 1908
	Consul general, Frankfurt.	5,500	May 4, 1910
	Died May 23, 1912.		
	Consul, Rouen.	2,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul general, Christiania.	3,000	Aug. 22, 1912
	Consul, Puerto Plata.	2,000	Mar. 7, 1910
	Consul, Saltillo.	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Lourenco Marques.	5,000	Jan. 6, 1898
	Consul, Dundee.	4,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul general, Beirut.	4,500	Dec. 19, 1910
	Consul, Madrid.	2,500	June 4, 1909
	Consul, Carlsbad.	3,000	Aug. 22, 1912
	Consul general, Athens.	5,000	June 22, 1906
	Consul, Saloniki.	3,500	Jan. 10, 1910
	Consul general, Smyrna.	3,500	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Plauen.	4,000	Aug. 23, 1905
	Consul, Lyon.	5,000	Dec. 14, 1910
	Consul general at large.	5,000	(¹)
	Consular assistant.	1,800	July 1, 1908
	Consul, Bradford.	3,500	June 2, 1909
	Consul, St. Pierre.	2,000	June 22, 1908
	Consul, Goteborg.	2,500	Mar. 8, 1912
	Consul, Melbourne.	5,000	June 10, 1908
	Consul, Vladivostok.	3,500	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Tsingtau.	4,000	(¹)
	Consul, Trebizond.	2,500	Dec. 11, 1905
	Consul, Kehl.	3,000	Dec. 20, 1911

¹ Nomination pending.

Appointments, transfers, and promotions, etc.—Continued.

Name and home address.	Post.	Salary.	Date.
Johnson, Felix S. S., Vine-land, N. J.	Consul, Bergen.	\$2,500	Aug. 17, 1906
Johnson, Henry Abert, Washington, D. C.	Consul, Kingston, Ont.	2,500	Jan. 10, 1910
Johnson, James W., New York, N. Y.	Consul, Liege.	3,000	Mar. 30, 1907
Johnson, Jesse H., Columbus, Tex.	Consul, Ghent.	3,000	Aug. 19, 1911
Keena, Leo J., Detroit, Mich.	Consul, Corinto.	3,000	Jan. 12, 1909
Kehl, John E., Cincinnati, Ohio.	Consul, St. Michaels.	3,000	(¹)
Kemper, Graham H., Georgetown, Ky.	Consul, Swansea.	3,000	Mar. 30, 1907
Kent, William P., Wytheville, Va.	Consul, Matamoros.	2,500	Jan. 12, 1910
Kirk, Milton B., Chicago, Ill.	Consul, Chihuahua.	2,500	May 31, 1909
Kitchen, William W., Gulfport, Miss.	Consul, Florence.	3,000	Dec. 14, 1910
Knabenshue, Samuel S., Toledo, Ohio.	Consul, Sydney, Nova Scotia.	3,000	June 10, 1908
Lahng, James Oliver, Kansas City, Mo.	Consul, Saigon.	3,500	Aug. 19, 1911
Latham, Charles L., Greenville, N. C.	Consul, Cartagena.	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
Lay, Julius G., Washington, D. C.	Consul general, Guatemala.	3,500	July 21, 1903
Lee, Samuel T., Ann Arbor, Mich.	Consul, Newchwang.	4,500	May 2, 1910
Leonard, Walter A., Evanston, Ill.	Consul assistant.	1,400	July 1, 1908
Letcher, Marion, Conyers, Ga.	Consul, Manzanillo.	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
Livingston, C. Ludlow, Pittsburgh, Pa.	Consul, Teneriffe, died Oct. 16, 1912.	2,500	Mar. 2, 1911
Long, James Verner, Pittsburgh, Pa.	Consul, Belfast.	5,000	Jan. 9, 1905
Lowrie, Will L., Elgin, Ill.	Consul general, Tientsin.	5,500	Aug. 27, 1909
Lupton, Stuart K., Clarksville, Tenn.	Consul, Malta.	2,500	Aug. 2, 1910
MacClintock, Samuel, Lexington, Ky.	Consul, Maracaibo.	2,500	(¹)
McConnico, Andrew J., Valden, Miss.	Consul, Cartagena.	2,000	Feb. 17, 1909
McGoogan, George B., Fort Wayne, Ind.	Consul, Punta Arenas.	3,000	Aug. 19, 1911
McNally, James C., Pittsburgh, Pa.	Consul general, Cape Town.	6,000	May 24, 1903
Magelssen, William C., Bratsberg, Minn.	Consul general, Rio de Janeiro.	8,000	May 2, 1910
Mahin, Frank W., Clinton, Iowa.	Consul, Nogales.	2,500	Aug. 15, 1907
Manning, Isaac A., Salem, Ore.	Consul, San Jose, Costa Rica.	3,000	May 31, 1909
Mason, Dean B., Cleveland, Ohio.	Consul, Stavanger.	2,000	Aug. 23, 1912
Maynard, Lester, San Francisco, Cal.	Consul, Acapulco.	2,500	June 2, 1907
Memminger, Lucien, Charleston, S. C.	Consul, Chihuahua.	2,500	Jan. 10, 1911
Michelson, Albert H., Cambridge, Mass.	Consul, Salina Cruz.	2,500	Jan. 10, 1910
Miller, Clarence A., Kansas City, Mo.	Consul, Swansea.	3,000	Jan. 10, 1910
Miller, Henry B., Eugene, Ore.	Consul, Venice.	2,000	Aug. 15, 1907
Moffat, Thomas P., Brooklyn, N. Y.	Consul, Malta.	2,500	Jan. 10, 1910
Moorhead, Maxwell K., Pittsburgh, Pa.	Consul, Venice.	2,000	Aug. 2, 1910
Morawetz, Albert R., Nogales, Ariz.	Consul, Erfurt.	2,500	June 10, 1908
Morgan, Henry H., New Orleans, La.	Consul, Carlsbad.	3,000	May 31, 1909
Moser, Charles K., Lewinsville, Va.	Consul general, Lisbon.	3,500	Aug. 22, 1912
Mosher, Robert Brent, Washington, D. C.	Consul, Catania.	3,000	Feb. 10, 1909
Myers, David J. D., La Fayette, Ga.	Consul, Karachi.	3,000	Aug. 27, 1909
Nathan, Edward I., Philadelphia, Pa.	Consul, Tampico.	3,000	(¹)
Northrup, Alfred S., Chicago, Ill.	Consul, Tegucigalpa.	2,500	May 31, 1909
Norton, Edward J., Memphis, Tenn.	Consul, Puerto Cortes, resigned Apr. 16, 1910.	2,500	Dec. 16, 1909
	Consul, St. John's, Quebec.	2,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Owen Sound.	2,500	(¹)
	Consul, La Paz, Mexico.	2,000	June 27, 1906
	Consul, Progreso.	3,000	June 2, 1909
	Consul, Georgetown; died at Mobile, Ala., Aug. 29, 1911.	3,500	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Nanking.	4,000	Mar. 30, 1907
	Consul, Tsingtau.	4,000	Apr. 15, 1910
	Consul, Hanover.	3,000	(¹)
	Consul, Colombo.	3,000	Feb. 20, 1909
	Consul, Melbourne.	3,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Nottingham.	4,500	June 11, 1902
	Consul, Amsterdam.	5,000	May 4, 1910
	Consul, La Guaira.	3,000	Feb. 18, 1909
	Consul, Barranquilla.	3,500	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, assistant.	1,800	July 1, 1903
	Consul, Algiers.	2,500	Dec. 18, 1911
	Consul, Vladivostok.	3,500	Mar. 11, 1908
	Consul, Harbin.	4,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Amoy.	4,500	Aug. 20, 1912
	Consul, assistant.	1,600	July 1, 1908
	Consul, Salina Cruz.	2,000	(¹)
	Consul, Turin.	2,000	Jan. 29, 1906
	Consul, Hanover.	3,000	Aug. 22, 1912
	Consul, Milan.	4,000	(¹)
	Consul, Matamoros.	2,500	Aug. 15, 1907
	Consul, Tampico.	3,000	Jan. 11, 1910
	Consul, Pernambuco.	4,000	(¹)
	Consul general, Yokohama.	6,000	Mar. 8, 1905
	Consul, Belfast; resigned Nov. 8, 1910.	5,000	Aug. 27, 1909
	Consul, Trinidad.	3,000	Feb. 17, 1909
	Consul, Bluefields.	3,500	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Managua, resigned Mar. 29, 1911.	3,000	Jan. 20, 1911
	Consul, Acapulco.	2,500	Jan. 13, 1908
	Consul, St. John, N. B.	3,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Rangoon.	3,500	Apr. 15, 1910
	Consul general at large.	5,000	Aug. 14, 1907
	Consul, Leipzig, retired Aug. 1912.	4,000	Jan. 12, 1910
	Consul, Amsterdam.	5,000	Apr. 29, 1907
	Consul general, Barcelona.	5,500	May 11, 1910
	Consul, Aden.	2,500	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Colombo.	3,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Port Elizabeth.	3,500	Nov. 21, 1908
	Consul general, Hankow.	4,500	Jan. 11, 1910
	Consul, Plauen.	4,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Puerto Cortes.	2,500	Aug. 24, 1912
	Consul, Patras.	2,000	Aug. 15, 1907
	Consul, Messina.	2,500	May 4, 1909
	Consul, Karachi.	3,000	(¹)
	Consul, Trebizond.	2,500	Mar. 8, 1912
	Consul, Asuncion.	2,000	Mar. 30, 1907
	Consul, Malaga.	3,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Bombay.	4,000	Aug. 22, 1912

Nomination pending.

Appointments, transfers, and promotions, etc.—Continued.

Name and home address.	Post.	Salary.	Date.
Olivares, José de, St. Louis, Mo.	Consul, Managua.	\$3,000	June 23, 1908
Osborne, John Ball, Scranton, Pa.	Consul, Madras.	3,000	Jan. 27, 1911
	Chief, Bureau of Trade Relations, Department of State.	2,500	May 17, 1905
Paddock, Gordon, New York, N. Y.	Consul, Havre.	5,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Patton, Kenneth S., Charlottesville, Va.	Consul, Tabriz.	3,000	June 24, 1910
Perry, Chas. B., Crete, Nebr.	Consul assistant.	1,400	Aug. 24, 1908
Pike, William J., Hallstead, Pa.	Consul, Asuncion.	2,000	(¹)
Pontius, Albert W., St. Paul, Minn.	Consul, Turin.	2,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Potter, Julian, New York, N. Y.	Consul, Kehl.	3,000	Mar. 30, 1907
Ragsdale, James W., Santa Rosa, Cal.	Consul, Reichenberg.	4,000	June 24, 1910
Rasmussen, Bertil M., McCallsburg, Iowa.	Consul, Swatow.	2,500	Jan. 22, 1909
Ravndal, Gabriel Bie, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	Consul, Chungking.	3,500	Jan. 10, 1910
Ray, John A., Whitewright, Tex.	Consul, Dalm.	3,500	Aug. 19, 1911
Reat, Samuel C., Tuscola, Ill.	Consul, Nassau.	3,000	Oct. 30, 1903
Robert, Albert W., Palm Beach, Fla.	Consul, Rouen.	2,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Robertson, William H., Richmond, Va.	Consul, St. Petersburg.	3,500	June 10, 1908
Rosenberg, Louis J., Detroit, Mich.	Consul general, Halifax.	4,500	Aug. 27, 1909
	Consul, Stavanger.	2,000	June 22, 1905
	Consul, Bergen.	2,500	Jan. 12, 1910
	Consul general, Beirut.	4,500	June 22, 1906
	Consul general, Constantinople.	6,000	Dec. 10, 1910
	Consul, Maskat.	2,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Maracaibo.	2,500	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Corinto.	3,000	(¹)
	Consul, Port Louis.	2,000	June 22, 1908
	Consul, Tansui.	3,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Algiers (retired, 1911).	2,500	May 31, 1909
	Consul general, Tangier.	3,500	Jan. 13, 1909
	Consul general, Callao.	4,500	May 2, 1910
	Consul general, Moscow.	5,500	(¹)
	Consul, Seville.	3,000	June 28, 1906
	Consul, Pernambuco.	4,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Barranquilla (declined appointment to Barranquilla and resigned Jan. 15, 1910).	3,500	Jan. 12, 1910
	Consul general, Vienna.	6,000	Mar. 26, 1903
	Consul general, Hongkong (died at post Apr. 15, 1910).	8,000	May 17, 1909
	Consul general, Seoul.	5,500	Mar. 30, 1907
	Consul general, Yokohama.	6,000	Aug. 27, 1909
	Consul, Bagdad.	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Ensenada, retired June 3, 1911.	2,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Aguascalientes.	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Aden.	2,500	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Nagasaki.	3,500	Mar. 30, 1907
	Consul, Kobe.	5,000	June 2, 1909
	Consul general, Seoul.	5,500	Aug. 27, 1909
	Consul, Mannheim.	3,500	Mar. 30, 1907
	Consul, Sherbrooke.	3,500	Mar. 21, 1912
	Consul, Fiume.	3,500	Aug. 20, 1912
	Consul general, Moscow.	5,500	June 10, 1908
	Consul, Lyon.	5,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Belfast.	5,000	Dec. 14, 1910
	Consul, Aguascalientes.	2,000	Apr. 9, 1907
	Consul, Martinique, resigned Apr. 19, 1910.	2,500	Apr. 13, 1910
	Consul, Bagdad.	2,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Ensenada.	2,000	June 8, 1911
	Consul, Nogales.	2,500	(¹)
	Consul, Sarnia.	2,500	July 16, 1909
	Consul, Messina.	2,500	Mar. 5, 1909
	Consul, Patras.	2,000	May 7, 1909
	Consul, Aguascalientes, resigned Apr. 8, 1911.	2,000	Apr. 13, 1910
	Consul, Kobe.	5,000	June 10, 1908
	Consul general, Moscow.	5,500	May 31, 1909
	Consul general, Sydney, Australia.	5,500	(¹)
	Consul, Port Antonio.	3,000	June 22, 1906
	Consul, Kingston, Jamaica.	4,500	June 7, 1910
	Consul, Leipzig.	4,000	Aug. 22, 1912
	Consul, Tegucigalpa.	2,500	(¹)
	Consul, Madras.	3,000	June 10, 1908
	Consul, Durban.	3,500	Dec. 19, 1910
	Consul, La Paz, Mex.	2,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul assistant.	1,800	July 1, 1903
	Consul, Belgrade.	3,000	Dec. 20, 1911
	Consul, Cornwall.	2,000	Mar. 13, 1912
	Consul, Port Louis.	2,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Stavanger.	2,000	Jan. 10, 1910
	Consul, Trinidad.	3,000	Aug. 22, 1912
	Consul General, Callao.	4,500	June 22, 1906
	Consul, Nottingham.	4,500	May 2, 1910
	Consul, Stettin.	2,500	Feb. 20, 1909
	Consul, Mannheim.	3,500	Apr. 9, 1912
	Chinese secretary at Peking.	3,600	Mar. 11, 1908
	Consul, Nanking.	4,000	Mar. 13, 1912
	Consul, Hanover.	3,000	June 20, 1906
	Consul, Sheffield.	3,000	Aug. 22, 1912
	Consul, Puerto Plata.	2,000	June 10, 1908
	Consul, Maracaibo.	2,500	Mar. 7, 1910
	Consul, Trieste.	3,000	Aug. 23, 1911
	Consul, Cape Gracias a Dios.	2,000	June 21, 1905
	Consul, Niagara Falls.	2,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Kingston, Jamaica.	4,500	May 8, 1907
	Assistant Solicitor, Department of State.	3,000	June 23, 1910
	Consul, Lyon.	5,000	(¹)

Nomination pending.

Appointments, transfers, and promotions, etc.—Continued.

Name and home address.	Post.	Salary.	Date.
Van Sant, Howard D., Island Heights, N. J.	Consul, Kingston, Ontario...	\$2,500	Sept. 15, 1905
Voetter, Thomas W., Santa Fe, N. Mex.	Consul, Dunfermline...	3,000	Jan. 11, 1910
Wakefield, Ernest A., Augusta, Me.	Consul, Saltillo...	2,000	Aug. 15, 1907
Wallace, Thomas R., Atlantic, Iowa.	Consul, La Guaira...	3,000	Aug. 19, 1911
Warner, Southard P., Kensington, Md.	Consul, Rangoon...	3,500	June 10, 1908
Washington, Horace Lee, Washington, D. C.	Consul, Port Elizabeth...	3,500	Jan. 11, 1910
Weddell, Alexander W., Richmond, Va.	Consul, Jerusalem...	3,000	Mar. 30, 1907
West, George N., Washington, D. C.	Consul, Martinique...	2,500	June 24, 1910
White, Jay, Lapeer, Mich.	Consul, Leipzig...	4,000	Aug. 9, 1904
Wilber, David F., Oneonta, N. Y.	Consul, Bahia...	4,000	Aug. 27, 1909
Wilder, Amos P., Madison, Wis.	Consul, Harbin...	4,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Williams, Charles L. L., Columbus, Ohio.	Consul general, Marseille...	5,500	June 10, 1908
Williamson, Adolph A., Washington, D. C.	Consul, Liverpool...	8,000	May 31, 1909
Willrich, Gebhard, Milwaukee, Wis.	Consul, Zanzibar...	2,500	Jan. 11, 1910
Winans, Charles S., Chelsea, Mich.	Consul, Catania...	3,000	Aug. 22, 1912
Winslow, Edward D., Chicago, Ill.	Consul general, Vancouver...	4,500	June 10, 1908
Wood, John Q., Honolulu, Hawaii.	Consul, Kobe...	5,000	Aug. 26, 1910
Yerby, William J., Memphis, Tenn.	Consul general, Bogota...	3,500	June 22, 1906
	Consul, Santos...	4,000	Aug. 27, 1909
	Consul general, Halifax...	4,500	Mar. 30, 1907
	Consul, Kobe...	5,000	Aug. 27, 1909
	Consul general, Vancouver...	4,500	Aug. 26, 1910
	Consul general, Hongkong...	8,000	Mar. 7, 1908
	Consul general, Shanghai...	8,000	May 17, 1909
	Interpreter, Chefoo...	1,500	July 1, 1908
	Interpreter, Newchwang...	1,500	July 6, 1909
	Consul, Swatow...	2,500	June 24, 1910
	Student interpreter, in Japan...	1,000	Oct. 8, 1906
	Consul, Antung...	2,500	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, St. Johns, New Brunswick...	3,000	Oct. 3, 1905
	Consul, Quebec...	3,500	June 9, 1909
	Consul, Valencia...	2,500	Mar. 30, 1907
	Consul, Seville...	3,000	May 31, 1909
	Consul, Tahiti...	2,000	June 24, 1910
	Consul, Goteborg...	2,500	Jan. 22, 1909
	Consul general, Stockholm...	3,500	Mar. 29, 1909
	Consul, Planen...	4,000	Dec. 14, 1910
	Consul general, Copenhagen...	3,000	Aug. 19, 1911
	Consul, Venice...	2,000	Jan. 12, 1910
	Consul, Tripoli...	2,500	Aug. 2, 1910
	Consul, Sierra Leone...	2,000	June 28, 1908
	Consul, Mersina...	2,500	(1)

(1) Nomination pending.

Mr. CLINE. That statement was made out and delivered to me about January 20, 1912, by the then Secretary of State, Mr. Knox. I am not an extreme partisan, but I wanted to know the facts connected with the Consular Service in which the appointments were made under the farce of a civil service examination stripped of political preferences. He sent me the names of the gentlemen who have been promoted, who have been appointed, who have been transferred to these positions. There were 212 out of 289 consuls of the United States when this new law became effective. I asked for the home address, the place to which they were appointed, and the salary, and when they were appointed or transferred. Out of the 212 I found that 199 were Republicans, and that there were 13 Democrats appointed in four years, or promoted or transferred, and that out of \$726,500 of salaries, the Democrats drew \$31,500, or less than 5 per cent of the amount that was paid to those men in those situations. The State of Massachusetts, that the gentleman [Mr. ROGERS] comes from, had five men appointed or transferred in that time, whose salaries equaled more than half of the entire amount that was coming for a year to the 13 representatives of the Democratic Party in the Consular Service, and yet the gentleman finds fault because a Democrat gets into the service.

The State of Illinois had 13 representatives appointed or transferred during the four years, commanding salaries amounting to \$43,500. The great State of Pennsylvania had 18 representatives appointed, transferred, or promoted during this time, carrying salaries amounting to \$62,000, twice the amount paid to the Democratic representatives for the entire United States. Only two of the 13 were appointed north of the Mason and Dixon line. What kind of salaries did they get? Six of them got \$2,000 a year, three of them got \$2,500 a year, three of them got \$3,000 a year, and one \$3,500 a year, and all of them occupying inferior and unimportant positions.

Mr. Chairman, that is an exemplification of the administration of the holy civil service under a Republican administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Charges d'affaires ad interim and vice consuls, \$50,000; total, \$587,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to inquire of the chairman of the committee the reason for putting the vice consuls separately in this item and not having them included under the general designation

for the Consular Service? I did not know that vice consuls were a part of the ambassadorial or legation force.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the reason for putting them there was that they might participate in this fund of \$50,000. The gentleman will recall that a few weeks ago Congress passed a law classifying the Consular Service and the secretaries of embassies and legations, and provided that vice consuls when acting as consuls should get the same proportion of the consul's pay that the charges d'affaires do of the ambassador's or minister's pay.

Mr. STAFFORD. I should think that would be included under the item, page 19, which relates to salaries of the Consular Service, rather than in this connection.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. What item?

Mr. STAFFORD. Page 19, the paragraph with the heading "Salaries of the Consular Service."

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The item on page 19 is for the salaries of consuls and consuls general. This item back here is a specific appropriation heretofore to pay the first secretary who is acting in the place of an ambassador or a minister half of the salary of such ambassador or minister when he was away from his post of duty. Now, under the new law we recently enacted, the vice consul acts in place of the consul general in the absence of such officer from his post of duty and gets half of the salary of that officer, and we put vice consuls in here in order that they might participate in this fund.

Mr. STAFFORD. The vice consul, of course, will not have any duties to perform connected with a legation or embassy.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Oh, no.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is why I asked the gentleman why it should be included here if it is really part of the Consular Service.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It may have been better to have divided the appropriation and put it in a different place.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES OF SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE.

For secretaries in the Diplomatic Service as provided in the act of January —, 1915, entitled "An act for the improvement of the foreign service," approved January —, 1915, \$157,500; *Provided*, That the amount appropriated for "Salaries of secretaries of embassies and legations" contained in the act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, is hereby made available for the salaries of secretaries in the Diplomatic Service at the rate of compensation specified in the act entitled "An act for the improvement of the foreign service," approved —, 1915; and there is also hereby appropriated for salaries of secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, to be expended in accordance with the provisions of the said act of January —, 1915, during the remainder of the fiscal year 1915, the additional sum of \$7,500.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a point of order pending.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Well, let the gentleman make it.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to make the point of order, at least I do not know that I do, but I want to inquire of the chairman of the committee in reference to this matter. This is apparently a deficiency appropriation. That is an appropriation for the current year.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. That was necessitated by reason of the fact on February 5 of this year the law went into effect reorganizing the service of secretaries of embassies and legations, and increased the compensation of secretaries taken as a whole to an amount that would equal this \$7,500 for the last four months of this fiscal year. The purpose of this proviso here is to enable the State Department to pay the balance of appropriations of this year which was made for secretaries of embassies and legations under the old system to the secretaries under the new law, and adds \$7,500 for the purpose of making their salaries what they would be under the new law from the 1st of March to the 1st of July.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Does not the gentleman think it would be a better form of appropriation for this to have been carried in the deficiency bill rather than in this bill? It is a deficiency.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Well, I do not know; I do not believe, under the circumstances, it would.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact this is simply a deficiency, as he is appropriating for the current fiscal year.

Mr. MANN. That is, the \$7,500 is a deficiency?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. And my question was if the gentleman did not think it would be better, at least, to have that amount carried in a deficiency bill rather than in this appropriation bill.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from North Carolina will permit, when the consular reorganization bill was passed there was some discussion whether the bill itself ought not to make available the existing appropriations for the payment of the reorganized service.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I recall it.

Mr. MANN. The fact is the gentleman from Virginia really wanted to have that done, although the way it came up it is probably not convenient; but as this is to make the present appropriations available for salaries, I can see there is some reason—

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I want to say to the chairman of the committee I shall not press the point of order, but I merely wanted to call his attention to the fact that this item belongs to a deficiency bill and not to this bill. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer four amendments to this section, all the same. On page 2, line 26, strike out the word "January" and insert "February 5."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 2, line 26, by striking out "January" and inserting "February 5."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. On page 3, line 2, strike out the word "January" and insert "February 5."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 3, line 2, by striking out the word "January" and inserting "February 5."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. On page 3, line 10, insert the words "February 5" after the word "approved."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 10, after the word "approved," insert the word and figures "February 5."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. On page 3, line 14, strike out the word "January" and insert "February 5."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 3, line 14, by striking out the word "January" and inserting the word and figure "February 5."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To pay the salaries of ambassadors, ministers, consuls, and other officers of the United States for the periods actually and necessarily occupied in receiving instructions and in making transits to and from their posts, and while awaiting recognition and authority to act, in pursuance of the provisions of section 1740 of the Revised Statutes, so much as may be necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the Chairman kindly indicate what appropriation is used for these respective services? One would expect there would be some amount appropriated in this paragraph, but none is included, and none was included in last year's act also.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It is provided for by the Revised Statutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The appropriation?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Whatever is necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. From what fund is the money paid? Here is an item without carrying any appropriation.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The Revised Statutes authorize it to be paid, and it is paid out of any money in the Treasury.

Mr. STAFFORD. But I assume the money is appropriated somewhere.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Here is the amount paid.

Mr. STAFFORD. Which amount?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The gentleman from North Carolina asked me what amount was paid. Last year it was \$109,700.

Mr. STAFFORD. But where is the money appropriated?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The Revised Statutes provide that it shall be a charge on the Treasury. Whenever the State Department draws on the Treasury for money on this account it is paid.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is a very exceptional case. I never knew of the Revised Statutes carrying an unlimited appropriation.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. We frequently impose an obligation on the Treasury, and when the conditions called for in the Revised Statutes are complied with, there is a payment. It is not unusual, though probably not the wisest method of legislating.

Mr. STAFFORD. When the statutes authorize the expenditure of the money and designate the sum, what is the need of carrying the paragraph?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It has been carried in this bill so long if it was left out some question would arise as to its payment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is the amount of money from which it is paid? That is the question that is difficult for me to understand.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It is paid out of any money in the Treasury. I can not make it plainer than that. We do not make any specific appropriation here. We simply recognize an existing law.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman from Virginia allow a question?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Then, whatever amount is paid out of the Treasury, out of this particular provision, is not included in the aggregate of the amount carried in this bill?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. In other words, if the amount appropriated in the bill is in excess of the amount shown in the report, such amount is paid in this paragraph?

Mr. STAFFORD. And last year the amount expended was \$109,000?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. One hundred and nine thousand and some odd dollars.

The Clerk read as follows:

Interpreter to legation and consulate general at Bangkok, Siam, \$1,500.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of interrogating the chairman of the committee in regard to the item we had under consideration at the top of this page. What is the reason that the amount that is necessary to meet this obligation can not be carried in the appropriation bill?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. There is no reason why it can not be done. The committee has just followed the custom of years.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. There are some customs that ought to be revised, and I should have thought that the gentleman from Virginia in taking charge of this bill would have been on the lookout for things of this sort.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I think the committee has in the last two years been on the lookout and revised a good many of them.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Now, the result of this is that here is an appropriation bill on its face carrying a certain sum of money—

Mr. COX. How much?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Something over \$4,000,000. And the facts are that the bill carries appropriations of an amount of money in excess of that—an undetermined amount. No Member of the House could possibly know how much. The chairman of the committee says that something like \$109,000 was expended under this item last year. Has the chairman of the committee any information as to what amount will likely be expended during the current year for which this appropriation is made?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I think it will be less this year than the year before.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Was information obtainable when the gentleman was constructing this bill to enable him and his committee to make a fairly accurate estimate of the amount of money that will be required under this item?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It will evidently be considerably less than it was last year, because there were more changes in the Diplomatic Corps last year than there will be this year.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The gentleman then could have carried in this bill as an appropriation for this purpose, say \$100,000, using the language, "or so much thereof as may be necessary," which would have fixed the amount that the bill carried.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. We could have done that.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I suggest to the gentleman next year in making up this bill that he take that under consideration.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. In order that we may know what amount of money we are appropriating.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I am much obliged to the gentleman.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I withdraw the pro forma amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

For 10 student interpreters at the legation to China, who shall be citizens of the United States, and whose duty it shall be to study the Chinese language with a view to supplying interpreters to the legation and consulates in China, at \$1,000 each, \$10,000: *Provided*, That said student interpreters shall be chosen in such manner as will make the selections nonpartisan: *And provided further*, That upon receiving such appointment each student interpreter shall sign an agreement to con-

tinue in the service as interpreter to the legation and consulates in China so long as his said services may be required within a period of five years.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee how the selections are made of these 10 student interpreters. Who has the power of naming them?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The State Department names them.

Mr. GOULDEN. And there is no civil service?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. They put them through a civil-service examination of their own. There is none provided by law.

Mr. GOULDEN. Does the gentleman know what particular requirements are demanded of those who apply for that examination—the age, educational qualifications, and so forth?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. They have to speak an additional language to the English language and stand an English examination. They have to be educated.

Mr. GOULDEN. Has the gentleman any idea about what age they have to be?

Mr. COX. I think it is from 18 to 35 years. I had an opportunity to look that up a few years ago.

Mr. GOULDEN. This looks like a fine opportunity for young men to see other countries. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESCUING SHIPWRECKED AMERICAN SEAMEN.

Expenses which may be incurred in the acknowledgment of the services of masters and crews of foreign vessels in rescuing American seamen or citizens from shipwreck, \$4,500.

THE SEAMEN'S BILL.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The Democratic Party came into power with a distinct platform promise to aid American seamen. Involuntary servitude on ships was to be ended forever. The priceless boon of freedom and liberty was to be guaranteed to the men who go down to the sea in the ships. Their independence and self-respect was to be encouraged. This doctrine was not only incorporated in the platform pledges, but it was proclaimed from the throats of a thousand spellbinders of greater or less force and magnitude throughout the Nation. All the coast cities were raided with these sturdy declaimers and their fair promises. Congress convened and the shipowners assembled. They lobbied and they explained. Every argument and influence they could summon was brought into play. The chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries was in London at a conference, and delay was necessary. Finally when it became apparent that the foreign shipowners were deceiving the public as to safety provisions and were sandbagging the seamen at that conference, Andrew Furuseth, the seamen's representative in this country, who was serving as one of the American delegates, packed up his belongings and left. He told the people of the United States that the shipping interests had control of that international conference.

Finally the chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, who is himself independent and faithful to duty, returned to his post here in this Congress. The report of the conference and the treaty it proposed was sent to the Senate for ratification.

Silence was the special order in the House committee on the much advertised promise of the Democracy to abolish involuntary servitude. Months passed and on my own motion the committee finally found itself in position to lay aside temporarily such questions as the renaming of merchant ships, the creation of lobster beds and fish hatcheries, and other matters and consider the seamen's bill which Senator LA FOLLETTE had forced through the Senate months and months before.

In the meantime there came up on this floor a recodification bill, and the statute on which involuntary servitude was based was read and reenacted. My motion to strike out the statute, which had been denounced as un-American by the Democratic platform, was rejected and the law was actually reenacted in violation of the platform.

Finally the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries wiped out the La Follette bill, all except the enacting clause, and reported a substitute which was so objectionable that the representative of the seamen of America, Andrew Furuseth, urged all friends of the seamen and of safety at sea to vote against the bill as reported. I had submitted a minority report against the bill. The committee got together again and submitted a further much improved substitute which was passed and sent over to the Senate about six months ago.

The international treaty was pending and action on the bill was continually delayed. In the meantime another election approached. The Democratic Party went before the people to

answer for its legislation and to tell how it had redeemed its platform pledges. A campaign textbook was issued and in violation of propriety, as it appears to me, the seamen's bill was referred to as one of the accomplishments of that session of Congress.

But the seamen's bill all the while rested quietly in the hands of Senate and House conferees, where it still lodges, and I fear is sleeping the sleep that knows no waking. The Shipping Trust is watching the bill. We are within 10 legislative days of adjournment. No report from these conferees is forthcoming, and rumors about the Capitol tell that they have about agreed on a report that will be pleasing to shipowners and will greatly displease the seamen.

It is doubtful, very doubtful, if any bill reported by these conferees can pass unless it meets with the tacit approval of the Shipping Trust and the all-night talkers in another House.

Plain, ordinary decency demanded a prompt report from these conferees long ago. Andrew Furuseth, in his position as to the international treaty, has been vindicated, for the treaty has been rejected because by its terms it made this legislation impossible. It seems to me that unless this bill is passed there will have been a deplorable lack of good faith and sincerity on the part of the Democratic Party in this matter.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. I just wanted to ask the gentleman relative to this provision appropriating for "the expenses which may be incurred in the acknowledgment of the services of masters and crews of foreign vessels in rescuing American seamen or citizens from shipwreck, \$4,500." The gentleman proposes to strike out this appropriation of \$4,500, and yet at the same time he speaks in behalf of the American seamen. It seems to me as being inconsistent.

Mr. BRYAN. Instead of the gentleman, as one of the leading representatives of the Democratic Party, taking up the proposition I submitted, he tries to take this motion of mine to strike out the last word, and which I took as the ground to present the argument I did present, and fails to refer to the real matter I presented. Why does not the gentleman say something about the seamen's bill and explain why his party and those in power here in this House and the other House fail and neglect to bring out this bill? There is a vast majority of this House in favor of it and a majority in the other House; yet it is absolutely neglected and no attention is paid to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. HARRISON. I want to oppose the motion of the gentleman from Washington. It strikes me he is trying to blow hot and cold at the same time.

We have not the American seamen's bill up now. I voted for the shipping bill and I am for the seamen's bill. We are now trying to do something for some oppressed seamen and trying to appropriate \$4,500 for them in this bill. This is the item that is now up for consideration.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say—

Mr. HARRISON. I do not yield now. This is the item that we must now vote on. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike from this bill this item of \$4,500 that is recommended to be appropriated for the seamen of this country. We are bound to conclude that the gentleman is sincere in his motion, and I oppose it, and I do not think the House ought to accept the view of the gentleman from Washington and strike out this item of \$4,500 for the seamen of this country. [Applause.]

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I trust that this amendment will not be adopted. It is to strike out the appropriation of \$4,500 for rescuing shipwrecked American seamen. The item has been carried in this appropriation bill for 30 years, and it has accomplished much good in behalf of shipwrecked American seamen. I trust the committee will vote down the gentleman's amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman can not do that. I make a point of order on that. There is a motion already pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] is out of order. He will have to get unanimous consent.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYAN. I do not propose to allow the RECORD to show that I am opposed to this appropriation of \$4,500. Those who

may read the RECORD will know that the motion was offered in order to present this matter to these two gentlemen; and now, not only the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] but the gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the committee in charge of this bill, gets up and, instead of answering the question I propounded in regard to the seamen's bill and its merits, indulges in the same joke that the gentleman from Mississippi has attempted to perpetrate on the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that there is a motion now pending.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I object.

Mr. BRYAN. I would like to call attention to the fact that the Democrats are really by their action advocating the amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. They will not strike it out.

Mr. BRYAN. They would like to strike out everything connected with the seamen's bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion that is pending before the House is that of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] to strike out the last word. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the commission to continue its work under the treaties of 1884, 1889, and 1905, \$7,500: *Provided*, That \$5,000 thereof is made immediately available to resume and continue the work relating to the distribution of water, under the direction of the Secretary of State, and as authorized by and in pursuance to the protocol of May 6, 1896, between the United States and Mexico, and to enable the commission to study the questions connected with the equitable distribution of the waters of the Rio Grande River between the citizens of the United States and Mexico, and to make an investigation under the supervision of the Secretary of State as to the best and most feasible method of preserving the boundary line between the United States and Mexico by preventing the flood waters of the Rio Grande and its tributaries where the said Rio Grande constitutes said boundary line from disturbing and changing the channel, and also the best and most feasible mode of impounding, regulating, and utilizing said waters in such manner as to secure to each country and its inhabitants their legal and equitable rights and interests in said waters, and to report in detail plans, findings, and conclusions to Congress not later than December 10, 1915.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HAY). Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to correct the spelling of the word "tributaries" on lines 2 and 3 of page 11.

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice, Mr. Chairman, in the report that the Department of State recommended an appropriation of \$50,000 in connection with this boundary commission, and the committee has reduced the amount appropriated last year from \$15,000 to \$7,500, and yet makes available for expenditure this year \$5,000.

First, I would like to inquire how much of the appropriation of \$15,000 is now available and the reason for the deficiency appropriation of \$5,000; and next, the reason for this new authorization about boundary lines between Mexico and Texas, along the Rio Grande.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It is not new. It was in the bill of last year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, it is all new, I will say to the gentleman, after the first four lines of the proviso.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. What does the gentleman mean by the first four lines?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that. The language is new from the beginning of line 15, page 10, down to the end.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is what I said—that all after the first four lines is new. The proviso begins on the fourth line.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The appropriation of \$7,500 is made under treaties between this country and Mexico. There is a commissioner on the part of this country and one on the part of Mexico to establish and keep established, so far as that can be done, the boundary line between this country and Mexico, and an appropriation of \$7,500 was made under this treaty. There is another commission, which has been acting under a protocol between this country and Mexico and under the authority of the State Department for quite a number of years, to determine the amount of water of the Rio Grande that citizens of the United States are entitled to and the amount that citizens of Mexico are entitled to.

As far as the boundary-line question is concerned, owing to the disturbed conditions in Mexico there is very little that can be done, and this appropriation was made simply for the pur-

pose of keeping the treaty alive until conditions got better in Mexico.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman furnish to the committee a statement of the amount under the \$15,000 appropriation that is now unexpended?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I think it is all expended.

Mr. STAFFORD. With nobody representing Mexico, and still the representative has gone ahead and spent \$15,000, and you are asking for only \$7,500 next year under the same conditions?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The gentleman must remember that we inherited these two commissions from a preceding administration. One of them was authorized under a treaty made by an administration prior to this one, and there were a number of officials employed to take the measurements of the waters of this river and kept an office at El Paso and one in Washington. The officials were there, and while they were not doing as much work as they might have done they still were there, and on the pay rolls of the Government. We reduced the appropriation from \$50,000 to \$15,000, and under that they could keep only a portion of these officials, but they still kept enough of them to consume this \$15,000, doing work which, while not strictly under these treaties, was of very great importance to the people on the American border in the State of Texas and work that the State of Texas and the citizens of that State were greatly interested in. We thought they could get along with even less than \$15,000, and we cut it down to \$7,500, which was enough to keep the organization in existence, so that when matters settle down in Mexico the commission will be there, the treaty will be alive, and our commissioner can cooperate with the Mexican commissioner in settling the questions that arise by reason of the changing channel of the Rio Grande River and the questions that have arisen in the past as to the equitable distribution of water.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then it is expected that this commissioner will, during the ensuing fiscal year, spend only \$2,500?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The boundary-line commission will spend only \$2,500.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman think \$2,500 will be sufficient to undertake this new work of providing an irrigation system for the Rio Grande?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I do not think it will be sufficient for any purpose in the world except to keep the commission alive. I do not think they can do very much work; but they will be there, and the treaty will be complied with by us, and the institution will be ready to be reestablished and go to work when Mexico gets into a condition to appoint a commissioner on her part.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand, then, that the commissioner, or the attachés connected with the commission, need some new work in order to justify their keeping themselves employed.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Not some new work.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is what you are delegating in this paragraph.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No; the gentleman misunderstood me.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is what you are delegating in this new authorization.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No; that work has been done for years. The difference between this bill and previous bills is that formerly the authorization was not made by Congress, but an appropriation of \$50,000 was made, and the State Department, under prior administrations, diverted the larger part of this \$50,000 to do this work that we have specified here in the second part of this section, without, as we thought, any authority of law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Since the new administration has taken hold, do I understand that the new commissioner has done none of the work authorized in this new authorization?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Oh, yes; he did it; but he did it under the authority of Congress in the last appropriation act.

Mr. STAFFORD. There was no such authority in the appropriation act as that contained in the lines following line 20.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It may not have been as specific and detailed as it is in this bill, but still the authority existed.

Mr. GARNER. The authority is given in the treaty.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understood, last year there was a jumble of authority, and the commissioner who had been appointed found that there was no system whatsoever, and he

went up to the State Department and protested about the conditions existing and claimed that there were duplications of work and the like, and thereupon the committee rearranged this item and provided a special authorization, as carried in last year's appropriation bill.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No; the gentleman is mistaken about that. The committee itself inserted the provision in the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was so represented to me by some persons attached to this commission.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Whoever informed the gentleman from Wisconsin was mistaken. The committee saw that that work had not been authorized by law. It was being done, and it was a very valuable work, and the committee put in this provision authorizing it.

Mr. STAFFORD. It must be very valuable if they are going to appropriate only \$2,500 for the ensuing year. Therefore I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the amount that has been appropriated, which I think will be interesting to the committee. Since the question of an international boundary between the United States and Mexico arose we have expended \$409,000. The appropriations ran year by year from \$20,000 to \$25,000, and when the new auxiliary came into existence the appropriation of larger sums, as high as \$50,000, took place, so that the entire amount expended has been \$656,000. The reason the appropriation is only \$7,500 was because the committee thought that was sufficient to keep the commission alive, as we knew that there could not be anything done during the present conditions in Mexico, except what would have to be done over again.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLINE. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice that from the State Department there was a proposition to construct on the upper part of the Rio Grande an irrigation project known as the Engle Dam, and it was thought that they ought to have \$50,000 for another project. How much has been expended on the Engle Dam?

Mr. GARNER. About \$12,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Texas says about \$12,000,000; that comes under the irrigation laws.

Mr. GARNER. We have no public lands in Texas.

Mr. COX. I want to ask the gentleman from Indiana, has this entire sum of money been expended for clerk hire and salaries?

Mr. CLINE. This goes way back to 1884, and that amount has been expended in keeping gaugers and engineers and surveyors, maintaining an office here at this capital in connection with it.

Mr. COX. It is all gone for salaries practically?

Mr. CLINE. Yes; and in determining the boundary rights of the Mexican people and ourselves.

Mr. COX. I do not know anything about the geography in that territory down there.

Mr. CLINE. A part of the money has been expended to determine the geography and where the boundary line was.

Mr. COX. Is it a fact that the Rio Grande is constantly changing its channel backward and forward, washing people that live in the United States over into Mexico, and vice versa?

Mr. CLINE. That is what the committee understands, and the further proposition is added to it to devise ways and means whereby the flood waters of the upper part of the Rio Grande can be impounded and saved.

Mr. COX. How long has that attempt been carried on to impound the flood water of the upper part of the Rio Grande?

Mr. CLINE. It is under advisement; there has been no attempt made to establish reservoirs.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman understand that the project is contemplated to ultimately create the erection of a great dam to impound the headwaters of the Rio Grande and prevent its overflow?

Mr. CLINE. No; I do not understand that there is any proposition determined. That is one of the things the country will have to consider.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I have just come in, and I did not hear all the debate on this paragraph. I think it has not been brought out just how the amount in question came to be recommended in the bill. We have been hearing a good deal in the last weeks and months, and very properly, too, about the need of economy in every department of government. We have been told that every Secretary and every subordinate was being urged and required to prune down estimates to the very lowest possible cent. I have in my hand the estimates for the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill of 1916 furnished the Committee on Foreign Affairs by the Department of State. On

page 13 of that print I find that in place of the \$15,000 which was allotted last year for this Mexican Boundary Commission the sum of \$50,000 is recommended this year, an increase of \$35,000, or some 300 per cent, over last year.

When the commissioner of that boundary commission, the Hon. John Wesley Gaines, came before the committee he was naturally asked why that increase was necessary at this time, when, as we all know, the boundary conditions are of the most chaotic description, and when it was obvious that in any bilateral undertaking, such as the settlement of a boundary, there could be no effective work done toward fixing that boundary.

Several questions were asked Mr. Gaines along that line. In the course of the testimony he said he had not been consulted in advance by the Department of State as to what amount should be called for. He said he had no knowledge, until the moment he came before our committee, of the amount asked for in behalf of his mission. Then this question was asked him:

What figures would you suggest in substitution for the \$25,000 and the \$50,000?

Mr. GAINES. Make it \$25,000 for the waterworks, or so much thereof as is necessary—the usual way when we do not exactly know—and let it be used under the administration of the Secretary of State, and say so literally.

Then, again, later, this question was asked him:

You have not given us in terms what you say you ought to have in place of the \$50,000.

Mr. GAINES. I am not an engineer, and I do not know what it would cost. Let it be \$25,000, or so much thereof as is necessary, for waterworks.

Mr. ROGERS. Instead of the \$50,000.

Mr. GAINES. Yes; we do not need \$50,000; I have looked far enough into it to see that.

Of course it did not need the testimony of Commissioner Gaines; it was obvious that with the prevailing conditions on the Mexican border, \$50,000 could not be judiciously expended there, nor any appreciable part of that sum. The committee thought it was wise and necessary to keep the commission alive, and having heard the testimony of Mr. Gaines, having considered the recommendation of the Department of State, cut the sum down from the \$50,000 which the State Department asked, from the \$25,000 which the commissioner asked, to \$7,500.

Mr. Chairman, I maintain that the recommendation of the Department of State, in these days when the most rigid economy is required in all branches of Government, for three or four times as much as last year, without reason and without foundation, was an insult to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, was an insult to this body. I maintain that those recommendations ought to be made with prudence and foresight, discrimination and care, and that we can not have the slightest confidence in any recommendation unless we know that their advice has been carefully considered by the Department of State, that it represents due study and accurately reflects present-day conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, there are two typographical errors in this paragraph that ought to be corrected at this time. Mr. FLOOD of Virginia rose.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman from Virginia that we correct those typographical errors in lines 3 and 8.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the typographical errors will be corrected.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Rogers] that the fact that the State Department sent an estimate greater than it turned out was needed to the Committee on Foreign Affairs was an insult to that committee. I think, on the contrary, it showed that the State Department had confidence in the committee, and knew that the committee would investigate the estimate and not make a report in favor of an estimate that was not justified by the facts and the law. And I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the way the State Department fell into this error was because for years, under Republican administrations, they had been sending estimates for this and giving appropriations for \$50,000 for this commission, when it was doing no more work than it did last year on \$15,000. I think the committee is deserving of the thanks of the House, as it has the confidence of the State Department, for investigating the estimates so carefully and reporting to this House only such sums as are necessary to properly carry on the work of the projects under that department. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia surely was not serious when he said that they did as much work last year as they did some years ago upon this boundary commission?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I am serious in that; yes.

Mr. MANN. Then the gentleman is not informed as to the facts. There is no work being done on this boundary commission now to speak of. We are paying a salary to a former Member of this House—and I have no objection to that—to maintain the commission alive; but for many years before the Mexican trouble got bad they were really working on this boundary commission.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. If the gentleman makes the statement that they did any work, he is ignorant of the facts.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I am not. I took the trouble to look this up, something which probably the gentleman has not done. There was a great deal of actual work done on this boundary commission, actual work in the field as well as in the office. It is a mere honorary position now, a sinecure.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It was a sinecure before, and for years the only thing the commission did was to work on what is known as the Chamizal case, being a litigation between citizens of this country and citizens of Mexico to determine in which country about 600 acres of land at El Paso was located. For years an appropriation of \$50,000 was made to keep up this commission, with a long list of high-paid officials, and, so far as we were able to find out, the only work they accomplished was the work they did on this Chamizal case, determining in which country a few ranches were located. When these gentlemen who constitute this commission came before the committee they themselves could tell of no other work that had been done. I was justified in saying that the work done by this commission last year upon \$15,000 was as great as the work that had been done heretofore for \$50,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of State to mark the boundary and make the surveys incidental thereto between the Territory of Alaska and the Dominion of Canada, in conformity with the award of the Alaskan Boundary Tribunal and existing treaties, including employment at the seat of government of such surveyors, computers, draftsmen, and clerks as are necessary; and for the more effective demarcation and mapping, pursuant to the treaty of April 11, 1908, between the United States and Great Britain, of the land and water boundary line between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, as established under existing treaties, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, including the employment at the seat of government of such surveyors, computers, draftsmen, and clerks as are necessary, and commutation to members of the field force while on field duty, actual expenses not exceeding \$2.50 per day each, to be expended in accordance with regulations from time to time prescribed by the Secretary of State, \$40,000, together with the unexpended balance of previous appropriations for these objects: *Provided*, That hereafter advances of money under the appropriation, "Boundary line, Alaska and Canada, and the United States and Canada," may be made to the commissioner on the part of the United States and by his authority to chiefs of parties, who shall give bond under such rules and regulations and in such sum as the Secretary of State may direct, and accounts arising under such advances shall be rendered through and by the commissioner on the part of the United States to the Treasury Department as under advances heretofore made to chiefs of parties.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Wisconsin reserve a point of order.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. That can not be done until the point of order is disposed of.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee why the provision is inserted on page 12, line 7, "that hereafter advances of money, etc.," thereby making permanent law?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it was in order to pay promptly the parties that the commissioners sent up on the Canadian boundary line. The representation made to the committee was that when the vouchers had to go through the State Department the pay was delayed and these parties were a long time getting their pay. It was practically done in this way before, but they wanted authority of law. They had been doing it in this way, but some question was raised by the Auditor of the State Department, and in order to prevent delay in paying these rodmen and laborers and others they wanted the matter made clear. We understand that the work will probably be completed within a year or two.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That being true, there was less necessity for making it permanent law than if it were going to continue for a longer period of time.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No. These men go up into the woods in Maine and they have a great deal of trouble getting up there and they need their pay promptly.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. What is the reason that that can not be done without this proviso?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. My recollection is that Dr. Tittmann said they would have to get a voucher for each man and it

would have to come back and be certified by the State Department before the auditor would pay.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Well, if the gentleman would leave out the word "hereafter," it would effect the same purpose.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The purpose of this was to make it only apply to this particular appropriation.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order and offer an amendment to strike out the word "hereafter" in line 7, page 12.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The amendment is acceptable.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have a reservation of a point of order pending. Mr. Chairman, I can not agree with the chairman of the committee, so far as the present explanation has been made, that there is any urgent need of giving the chairman of this commission full authority to control the moneys expended by the commission. We are acquainted with conditions existing in other branches of the service where the persons who perform work in the field receive their money direct and are obliged to give vouchers therefor, and I do not think it is a very good system of accounting to pay over the money entirely to one man, even though he is under bond, and allow him to determine whether the money is properly expended by his subordinates. I think it is a better system of checks and control to have the individual employees give vouchers, as in the Postal Service, rather than depute to one man the privilege and have the money go through his subordinates without check or control. Now, it is true the Coast and Geodetic Survey has it to some extent, but I question whether we should depart from the present practice; and unless the gentleman can give some further reason, I shall feel constrained to make the point of order on the proviso.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Here is what the commissioner said:

The system of direct advances to chiefs of parties has caused serious delays, principally because as much as a month elapses between the time a field officer makes requisition for funds and the date he receives notice that they are placed to his credit, and, further, because the system of direct advances to field officers imposes upon them the necessity of extensive accounting.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to say to the gentleman that I read the report, but it did not satisfy me there should be any change made. Here under the existing practice the chief of parties receives these moneys, and he accounts for them and is obliged to give vouchers. If we pay all that money over to one man there will be no check whatsoever, but merely the bond received from the various individuals.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. And the account he renders for it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The comptroller and auditor do not pass upon those. I think, Mr. Chairman, it would be a bad practice to adopt this policy, and therefore I make the point of order on the proviso, beginning line 7, page 12.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, by inserting after the word "necessary," in line 2, page 12, the following: "And including a sum not exceeding \$50 per month as additional compensation for the clerk of the Coast and Geodetic Survey disbursing these funds."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order. Does the gentleman wish me to reserve it?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I will reserve it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to carry out what was recommended by the State Department. The State Department recommended that the chief clerk of the Coast and Geodetic Survey be paid an additional \$50 per month as disbursing agent. Now, when this commission was organized, in 1903, the chief clerk was asked to take charge of the disbursements, and for many years he continued this work until it became quite onerous. In 1913 a letter was written to the chief clerk, Nicholas G. Henry, which is as follows:

MARCH 24, 1913.

Mr. NICHOLAS G. HENRY,
Coast and Geodetic Survey, Washington, D. C.

SIR: At the request of Mr. O. H. Tittmann, Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, you are hereby appointed a special disbursing agent of this department to disburse, under the direction of Mr. Tittmann, so much of the appropriation of \$75,000 provided for in the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation act of April 30, 1912, and the unexpended balance of previous appropriations as may be actually necessary to mark the boundary and make the surveys incidental thereto between the Territory of Alaska and the Dominion of Canada in conformity with the award of the Alaskan Boundary Tribunal and existing treaties and for the more effective demarcation and mapping, pursuant to the treaty of April 11, 1908, between the United States and Great

Britain, of the land and water boundary line between the United States and the Dominion of Canada as established under existing treaties.

It has been decided to allow you \$50 per month for your additional services as special disbursing agent of the department, to cease when in the judgment of Mr. Tittmann your services are no longer required.

A blank form of bond for execution by you in the penal sum of \$20,000 is herewith inclosed, together with three cards which you are requested to sign for the use of the accounting officers of the Treasury Department.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

ALVEY A. ADEE,
Acting Secretary of State.

Now, Mr. Henry entered upon the work and for several months he received \$50 per month, but the auditor in looking over the accounts decided that there was no authorization for this \$50 per month, and, though he was doing the work and had been paid, decided that he could not be paid because there was no authorization. So he put it up to the comptroller and the comptroller decided definitely that the payment could not be made, because there was no authority for it.

Now, Mr. Henry has continued to do that work. He is a splendid and efficient man. He gets only \$1,800 a year, and he has spent the larger part of his leave each year in catching up with this disbursing work and tabulating it, and so forth. In fact, I believe he received last year nine and three-eighths days of his entire leave, and the balance of it he spent on his books in this matter. Each and every day during the year he keeps these accounts. He can not do it during his time in the office, because he has too much other work to do, and he does it after his hours are over, at night. He is a man who knows how to do it, has made a splendid official, and he has been in the department for years, and has been doing this work. The State Department wants him to have the \$50 per month; the State Department, under Acting Secretary of State Adees, wanted him to have the \$50 per month; and there is no authorization for it. He has been doing the work outside of his regular official duties, and he has been giving a bond of \$20,000 for the faithful performance of that work, and the premium on that \$20,000 bond he has been paying out of his own pocket. He could not complain, because he accepted the job, and he believed he was going to get the \$50 a month, but the comptroller found he could not be paid. I know this gentleman, and I believe that you, if you could see him and talk to him, would find out, as I have found out, that this is a meritorious case and that he is entitled to this money.

Mr. BORLAND. I would like to have the gentleman yield to me long enough to ask the chairman of the committee who acts as disbursing clerks of these other commissions?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have only a couple of minutes. I will not yield for a question as to some other commissions. If you want to ask about this one, all right.

Mr. BORLAND. It strikes me that this can not be an isolated case. It must occur in other commissions.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I think there must be some money provided out of which they are paid in those other funds. I am anxious that this man should receive this extra \$50 a month, because he has performed the duty, and the State Department says he ought to have it and they recommend it. We did not have all the facts before us, and it was stricken out of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a remark or two concerning the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. COX. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to increasing the salaries, especially of this commission. It has been the most expensive piece of work that this Government has ever undertaken by way of a commission. We have expended on the boundary line between Alaska and Canada—and I am not finding any particular fault with that, because the difficulties necessarily encountered to establish the boundary line there are very great—we have expended in establishing the boundary line between Alaska and Canada \$668,000 in round numbers.

Mr. COX. How long has it been running?

Mr. CLINE. From 1905 to 1912. The unfinished work, which was a very small amount, was then transferred from the Alaska boundary line to the commission that had charge of the boundary line between the United States and Canada, and the total amount expended between the United States and Canada, and that work consisted chiefly of remonumenting the line, the line having been established some time about 1850. But we have expended in remonumenting that line \$749,176, and this commission did not have jurisdiction over more than 1,000 miles of the line between the United States and Canada. Over 1,000 miles of the line is a water boundary under the jurisdiction of another commission. It illustrates the absolute necessity for some different manner of making appropriations

for these commissions. As I have said, we expended \$749,176 to establish the Canadian boundary. To survey the Northern Pacific Railroad from 1866 to 1870—and I understand they made three surveys; that is, they surveyed three different routes—the directors of the organization spent only \$250,000. I am not including the amount, of course, that the Government paid for sending the Army along to keep the Indians off the survey. But the actual expenses of the survey by the directors of the Northern Pacific Railroad were \$250,000, and yet we have spent in remonumenting this line between the United States and Canada \$749,176, and the end is not yet.

I shall incorporate at this point in my remarks the data furnished me by the State Department showing the amounts appropriated, available, and expended, respectively, on the boundary between the United States and Alaska and between the United States and Canada year by year since the projects have been undertaken.

Appropriation, "Boundary line, Alaska and Canada," for fiscal years 1905 to 1912.

Year.	Appropriations and balances.	Total available.	Expenditures.	Balances.
1905.....	\$100,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$36,206.40	\$63,793.60
1906.....	65,000.00	128,793.60	49,191.53	79,602.07
1907.....	163,793.60			
1908.....	25,000.00	104,602.07	59,893.27	44,708.80
1909.....	179,602.07			
1910.....	50,000.00	94,708.80	78,553.52	16,155.28
1911.....	144,708.80			
1912.....	75,000.00			
1903.....	116,155.28			
1910.....	100,000.00	191,155.28	189,477.36	1,677.92
1911.....	100,000.00			
1912.....	1,677.92			
1912.....	200,000.00	301,677.92	225,106.27	76,571.65

¹ Available balances from previous appropriations reappropriated and made available for expenditure during succeeding fiscal year.

The appropriations, "Boundary line, Alaska and Canada" and "Boundary line, United States and Canada," were combined by Congress for the fiscal year 1913, the unexpended balances of both appropriations being reappropriated and made available for use, together with the new appropriation, under the title, "Boundary line, Alaska and Canada and United States and Canada."

Appropriation, "Boundary line, United States and Canada," for fiscal years 1904 to 1912.

Year.	Appropriations and balances.	Total available.	Expenditures.	Balances.
1904.....	\$100,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$64,399.48	\$35,600.52
1905.....	100,000.00	135,600.52	67,064.42	68,536.10
1906.....	135,600.52			
1907.....	50,000.00	118,536.10	25,864.19	92,671.91
1908.....	168,536.10			
1909.....	20,000.00	112,671.91	6,297.69	106,374.22
1910.....	192,671.91			
1911.....	20,000.00	126,374.22	19,730.78	106,643.44
1912.....	1106,374.22			
1909.....	20,000.00	126,643.44	36,954.85	89,688.59
1910.....	1106,643.44			
1911.....	25,000.00	114,688.59	65,026.75	49,661.84
1912.....	189,688.59			
1911.....	105,000.00	154,661.84	66,747.57	87,914.27
1912.....	149,661.84			
1912.....	95,000.00	182,914.27	91,939.76	90,974.51
1912.....	187,914.27			

¹ Available balances from previous appropriations reappropriated and made available for expenditure during succeeding fiscal year.

The appropriations, "Boundary line, United States and Canada," and "Boundary line, Alaska and Canada," were combined by Congress for the fiscal year 1913, the unexpended balances of both appropriations being reappropriated and made available for use, together with the new appropriation, under the title, "Boundary line, United States and Canada and Alaska and Canada."

Appropriation, "Boundary line, Alaska and Canada and United States and Canada," fiscal years 1913 to 1915.

Year.	Appropriations and balances.	Total available.	Expenditures.	Balances.
1913.....	\$75,000.00	\$242,546.16	\$182,851.29	\$59,694.87
1914.....	190,974.51			
1915.....	276,571.65	159,694.87	122,298.82	37,396.05
1914.....	100,000.00			
1915.....	59,694.87	137,396.05		
1915.....	100,000.00			
1915.....	37,396.05			

¹ Available balance from appropriation "Boundary line, United States and Canada, 1912."

² Available balance from appropriation "Boundary line, Alaska and Canada, 1912."

³ Available balances from appropriations for 1913 and 1914, reappropriated and made available for expenditure during fiscal years 1914 and 1915, respectively.

I want to say that it illustrates the viciousness of making a lump-sum appropriation to these commissions. Of course, they say a man ought not to complain about a method for expending money when he has no better theory to advocate, but there is not a man here who is acquainted with private business who would turn over such sums to be expended without better supervision. And we have made available in several instances more than \$250,000 to this commission to dip into and spend here and there wherever they thought it was necessary. I say that is a waste of public funds. It is illustrated by a remark I once heard from a great Republican orator who is now deceased. He said that Uncle Sam would spend a dollar as though it was a leaf and that leaf as though he owned the whole unbounded forest. I simply make the statement that we are compelled to take these estimates from men who are interested always in increasing their respective appropriation, and we have no way of determining the actual amount necessary. We ought not to make such an appropriation as this, and for that reason the committee at this time cut down the amount that was appropriated to \$40,000 and made available the unexpended balance. The commission last year worked from about the 1st of May to the 1st of October. Of course, the surveyors come back and make a permanent record of the field notes and the topographers make the necessary maps in connection with the survey. But no man can make me understand that it is necessary to spend in remonumenting the line between the United States and Canada \$746,000, with two or three years yet to run.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out, on page 12, line 3, after the word "duty," the comma and inserting the word "or."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 12, line 3, by striking out, after the word "duty," the comma and inserting the word "or."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether that is the proper thing to do; but the language of the bill as it reads, I think, can not be understood. It says, "Commutation to members of the field force while on duty, actual expenses not exceeding \$2.50 per day each," and so forth. If the commutation is to be limited to \$2.50, then the amendment that I have offered is the proper amendment.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. What is the language now?

Mr. MANN. "Commutation to members of the field force while on duty, actual expenses not exceeding \$2.50 per day each." In either case the amendment I offer limits the commutation.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. LINTHICUM. In reference to what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] says about increasing salaries, I think this stands on a different basis from the ordinary increase. Here is a man who was appointed by the Secretary of State to do this work. He was ordered to do it, and he took out a bond of \$20,000, and he has been disbursing over \$200,000 each year. He was receiving \$50 a month for this service, according to the Secretary's own letter. Yet you say he should not have it. If he took that appointment in good faith and has done the work and given the bond and paid for it out of his own pocket in all equity he is entitled to the increase promised him by the department.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. CLINE. Is not that the argument that any man can make about increasing his salary?

Mr. LINTHICUM. No. Here is a man who is appointed to an office outside his regular duties. He is ordered to give a bond. He gives a bond, and he pays for it out of his own pocket, and does the work, and now you say he ought not have the salary promised him.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maryland yield to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Is it not a fact that this salary was contracted for and paid for some years and then under a ruling of the auditor he had to refund?

Mr. LINTHICUM. It is a fact that he received it for several months, and when the auditor said there was no authority for it, he received it no longer; and then the State Department

recommended that it be put into the bill, so that he would have the authority to pay him.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maryland yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do.

Mr. STAFFORD. When was that decision made?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not know exactly; but it was about three months after March 4, 1913—in June or July. There was a decision to the effect that he could not receive it. He has since been doing the work and paying the premium on the bond.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is his salary?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Eighteen hundred dollars. He is earning it. I am sorry that the gentleman saw proper to make the point of order to that. It is a just claim.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maryland yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Is there any question about the authority of the official who wrote that letter and made that promise?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not know anything about the authority he had. He was the Acting Secretary of State. I presume he thought he had the authority. He thought the money could be paid out of the regular fund as compensation for his services as disbursing agent, and he told him to go ahead and do it, and he did it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL PRISON COMMISSION.

For subscription of the United States as an adhering member of the International Prison Commission, and the expenses of a commission, including preparation of reports, \$2,550.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. What does the evidence show as to what that \$2,500 is expended for?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It began many years ago, I think in 1846. I think the organization was effected on the initiative of this country. Conferences are held every five years. Twenty nations are members of it. The object is to study the treatment of criminals, to promote prison reform, the general suppression of crime, and the rescue of children. The United States became a member 20 years ago. The first regular appropriation we made was in 1897. The quota was paid to the prison bureau at Berne, Switzerland. The American commissioner is Dr. Charles R. Henderson. He is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of State. His reports have to be made to the Secretary of State.

Mr. BORLAND. How much was the first appropriation?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The same as this one.

Mr. BORLAND. About \$2,500 a year?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. How does it happen that our expenses as one member of that body run \$2,500 a year? With the meeting only once in five years, how can they absorb that amount of money?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. They keep a bureau at Berne, with a considerable number of clerks and officials in it, and get out very valuable literature. There are only 20 adhering nations, so that does not mean a very large total amount of money. They pay in proportion to the population, I think, so they do not all pay as much as we do.

Mr. BORLAND. There is a meeting only once in five years?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. They meet only once in five years, but the work is kept up all the time. The bureau is maintained regularly.

Mr. BORLAND. Once in five years we send representatives, do we?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Once in five years there is a meeting of the representatives of these different nations.

Mr. BORLAND. Do we have an additional expense at that time?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No; this appropriation covers that.

Mr. BORLAND. Are all of the expenses paid out of this fund?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The expenses of our commissioner, Dr. Henderson, of Chicago, are paid out of it; yes.

Mr. BORLAND. I thought something in the hearings of the committee would show what they spent the money for.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Some of it is spent in publication work.

Mr. BORLAND. Do we have a separate employee there?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No.

Mr. BORLAND. No American representative?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No; but the reports are published and sent out.

Mr. BORLAND. I take it when we have occasion to send a delegate to that meeting we send some American official who is in Europe, convenient to the place of the meeting, do we not?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Dr. Charles R. Henderson, of the University of Chicago, goes as our delegate.

Mr. BORLAND. What is his official position?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Dr. Charles R. Henderson, of the University of Chicago, is the representative of this country in that congress.

Mr. BORLAND. That amount seems to be a good deal in comparison with the amount we pay for keeping up the bureau for the suppression of the African slave trade. That is only \$125.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. But the activities of this bureau are much larger. The printing is considerably more.

Mr. BORLAND. I suppose the committee have looked into it to see whether this continuing expense ought to go on.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I notice in the hearings, according to the statement of Mr. Carr, that this is the sum contributed annually, and that it has remained the same for many years, although the population has increased; that it is now proposed to request the Government to contribute the maximum sum mentioned, namely, 50 francs for each 1,000,000 inhabitants, and that several governments have already signified their intention to grant this increased contribution. This is the quota of the United States in that amount.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Has the gentleman from Virginia any objection to recurring to page 12, line 24, for the purpose of inserting a comma after the word "Continent"? There should be one there.

Mr. FOSTER. The enrolling clerk has the power to correct the punctuation.

Mr. MOORE. I ask unanimous consent to insert a comma after the word "Continent," in line 24, page 12. I do not press it at all unless the gentleman from Virginia agrees to it. As it reads there it says, "in a certain defined zone of the African Continent of firearms."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to insert a comma after the word "Continent," in line 24, page 12. If there be no objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAN AMERICAN UNION.

Pan American Union, \$75,000: *Provided*, That any moneys received from the other American Republics for the support of the Union shall be paid into the Treasury as a credit, in addition to the appropriation, and may be drawn therefrom upon requisitions of the chairman of the governing board of the Union for the purpose of meeting the expenses of the Union and of carrying out the orders of said governing board: *And provided further*, That the Public Printer be, and he is hereby, authorized to print an edition of the monthly bulletin not to exceed 6,000 copies per month, for distribution by the Union during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee what amount of money has been contributed by the different American Republics.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. To the Pan American Union?

Mr. GOULDEN. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The rest of them contribute \$50,000.

Mr. GOULDEN. I notice it says here—

That any moneys received from the other American Republics for the support of the union shall be paid into the Treasury as a credit, in addition to the appropriation, and may be drawn therefrom upon requisitions of the chairman of the governing board of the union for the purpose of meeting the expenses of the union and of carrying out the orders of said governing board.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It is based on population.

Mr. GOULDEN. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF THE PERMANENT COURT OF ARBITRATION.

To meet the share of the United States in the expenses for the calendar year 1914 of the International Bureau of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, created under article 22 of the convention concluded at The Hague, July 29, 1899, for the pacific settlement of international disputes, \$1,250.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the chairman's attention again to the fact that here is a very important international organization, and our contribution to that is only \$1,250. It does seem on further investigation that \$2,550 for a

prison commission is an amount that is not properly represented by the amount of work that we get out of them.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The committee did not agree with the gentleman about that. They did make inquiry into it, and as the gentleman from Mississippi called the attention of the gentleman from Missouri to the fact, it was the purpose to increase it rather than to decrease it. They seem to have the idea that the work that is appealing to the different countries which are parties to it is a work that is valuable to those who are interested in improving prison conditions all over the world.

Mr. BORLAND. I have never seen or heard of any of their work, so it can not be very far-reaching.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The gentleman from Illinois by my side and the gentleman from Illinois on the other side and the committee have inquired into it, and they are all of the opinion that the work is very valuable, and probably next year there will be a proposition to increase the appropriation.

Mr. BORLAND. And I think the proposition will not be met. Twelve hundred and fifty dollars for the international bureau of the permanent court of arbitration is a very reasonable sum, but \$2,550 for a prison commission seems to me more than we get out of it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I will.

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I make the suggestion that the amount of which the gentleman speaks as being somewhat extravagant carries a delegate?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. A commissioner.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I used the word delegate to bring out the idea of a representative. In the Hague tribunal the appropriation does not cover the delegate, but only our proportional part for the maintenance of the bureau itself.

The Clerk read as follows:

The judge of the said court and the district attorney shall, when the sessions of the court are held at other cities than Shanghai, receive in addition to their salaries their necessary actual expenses during such sessions, not to exceed \$10 per day for the judge and \$5 per day for the district attorney; and so much as may be necessary for said purposes during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, is hereby appropriated.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to inquire the reason why you single out the district attorney and pay his actual expenses, and not accord the same consideration to the marshal and the clerk when they are obliged to accompany the court when held at some other place than Shanghai.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. We do it in the interest of economy.

Mr. STAFFORD. You have been doing it all along, and it is not fair treatment. Why single out one and deprive the other two, who have equally meritorious claims, when they are obliged to accompany the court when held at a place other than Shanghai? If the gentleman is going to economize, why not eliminate all? Why single out the higher officials and leave the fellows with smaller salaries to pay their own expenses?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I am willing to eliminate all of them. We have carried this provision for years. We inherited it and have not thought to change it.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Illinois will allow me, I think they have a court bailiff at each place.

Mr. STAFFORD. But they have no clerk.

Mr. MANN. I think they have.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have been informed that they have not, and that the clerk is obliged to accompany the court to each place.

Mr. MANN. They could have a clerk at each place.

Mr. STAFFORD. I say that the clerk is entitled to his expenses as well as the marshal.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The clerk and the marshal can have deputies at these places.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman realizes that that would cost a great deal more than it would to pay their expenses, at not to exceed \$5 a day, when accompanying the court.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The marshal could not have a deputy unless he paid him, because his salary is fees.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt he has a bailiff.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not sufficiently advised about that, but I do not believe that the gentleman or his committee is in favor of putting a wet blanket on the judge and district attorney holding court at other places than at Shanghai when the purpose of justice demand, which would happen if you struck out these lines.

I will not offer an amendment this year, but I would like to have the gentleman and his committee next year inquire into as to why the clerk and the marshal should not receive the same treatment.

Will the gentleman kindly bear in mind next year an inquiry into whether there is any reason for not paying the clerk's

expenses if he accompanies the court, as I understand he does.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes; we will look into it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and I do so for the purpose of asking the chairman a question. I have understood that in this court in China, where we are paying a total of \$28,800 a year, that there are not more than a dozen cases a year, and that those are of trivial importance.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is mistaken. I made a special inquiry of a gentleman in the State Department, whom I believe is as well informed as anyone in this country about this, and he told me that the business was considerable.

Mr. BAILEY. I understood from a gentleman who has been practicing before that court more or less, and was told within an hour, that there were very few cases.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Who is the gentleman to whom the gentleman alludes?

Mr. BAILEY. A Mr. Curtis.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. He has been before committees of Congress here for the last four or five years making representations about this court that an investigation of our committee does not show to be correct.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman was before a committee of which I have the honor to be a member a few months ago and made certain charges, which were so well sustained that the judge against whom they were filed was compelled to retire, and did retire.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. There is now another judge there.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I referred to his statement about there being no business before the court. I was informed, as I say, by an official of the State Department that there was a great deal of business in this court and that Mr. Curtis's statement in reference to that matter is incorrect. He made that statement to me. I do not know that he ever appeared before the committee, but he made it to me personally, and he has been around Congress here making attacks on this court for a number of years on account of differences which he had with the judge who has resigned.

Mr. BAILEY. I have also been informed, whether correctly or not, that the district attorney in the China court was not a lawyer at all.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Oh, that is a mistake. I think the gentleman is a young lawyer, but he is a lawyer, and a good one.

Mr. BAILEY. The allegation is made that he is not a lawyer at all.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman that I have a friend who is to be marshal of this court and who is also a lawyer.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I believe this court is of sufficient importance to be retained in China on account of the conditions in the Orient at the present time, and even if there were no cases before the court it should be retained for the purpose of maintaining the dignity and standing of the country. The fact of the matter is that many cases are brought before this court, and the marshal made many arrests last year. He made 8 or 10 arrests in December. What I want to call the attention of the committee to is the fact that, while the marshal may have a deputy and the clerk may have a deputy at places where the court is held other than Shanghai, there is but one stenographer connected with the court, and his salary is \$1,800 a year, and out of that \$1,800 a year he has to pay all of his traveling expenses and his hotel bills while he is absent from the location of the court at Shanghai. I think that next year the committee ought to arrange for the proper care of these lower paid officials.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, United States agency: Two counsel, at \$2,520 per annum; one stenographer, at \$1,200 per annum; and messenger, \$720 per annum; in all, \$4,440.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I desire to move to strike out the words "in all, \$4,440."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 25, strike out the words "in all, \$4,440."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the item says "two counsel, at \$2,520 per annum." Is it intended to have two counsel at that sum each?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MANN. It would be necessary to say "each," then; and then the gentleman could move to change the total. As the bill reads without the word "each" the two counsel combined would get \$2,520.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the intention of the committee is to provide for two counsel at \$2,520 each, and I make that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 24, after the word "annum," insert the word "each."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Now I suggest that the gentleman correct the total.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the former amendment in respect to the total and offer another amendment, to change the figures "\$4,440" to "\$6,960."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 25, strike out "\$4,440" and insert "\$6,960."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee a few questions in regard to this item, in which I notice that there is a considerable reduction. I certainly do not take any exception to that, but I am interested in knowing exactly how the committee arrived at a knowledge of what particular positions should be eliminated. For instance, I notice here that the bill provides for two counsel at \$2,540 each. At the same time the committee has eliminated the position of joint secretary provided for under current law. I assume the gentleman will say that this economy was made possible by the fact that it is not expected that the commission will be able to do much during the next fiscal year toward the settlement of claims. If that be true, I do not understand why you want two counsel. It seems to me a secretary might be needed for the purpose of taking care of the business and papers, and so forth, of the commission.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman the committee thought this tribunal would be able to do very little work during this year, but it was constituted under a treaty, and we thought it wise to keep the tribunal together and to keep some person in charge of the office who would take charge of the papers, the books, the briefs that had been prepared when the tribunal last met; and in doing that we decided to dispense with the high-priced lawyers, such as the agent at \$7,500, the attorney at \$5,000, also dispensing with the law clerk at \$1,800; and we kept those two attorneys, one of whom would act as disbursing officer, and they could work on those cases during the time between now and the next assembling of the tribunal, and by making this arrangement we save \$40,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Do I understand it is expected that one of the counsel shall act in the place of the secretary?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Act as disbursing officer instead of the joint secretary; that was the idea the committee had.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The item does not say so; it makes no provision for that.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The duties may be imposed upon him by the Secretary of State.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I was going to suggest there is no work for a joint secretary while the commission is not in session, and this work is being carried on and the pending cases are being carried on by these two counsel.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. From the statement made by the gentleman from Virginia, it seems to me the only work that is expected to be done by this commission during the next fiscal year would be such as is usually done by a secretary.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. This is not the secretary. This is the joint secretary, the secretary who acts and works when England and the United States are both represented.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am not going to offer any amendment, for if I had any idea of doing so I do not think it would be adopted; but from the statement made in detail of the duties of these counsels it seems to me they are more peculiarly the duties of the secretary rather than of a counsel, as I understood the gentleman to say that about all to be done was to look after the papers, books, and briefs, and keep the records straight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Just a moment. No; the joint secretary acts as disbursing officer of this tribunal, and we think one of these attorneys can do that, and then they could spend their time preparing cases that they already have, so as to be ready to submit them to the tribunal when it next meets; but I believe the result will be that the State Department will not keep at least one of them. I think there is only one there at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fisheries convention, United States and Great Britain: For the payment of the actual and necessary expenses of a commissioner on the part of the United States under the convention between the United States and Great Britain concerning the fisheries in waters contiguous to the United States and the Dominion of Canada, signed at Washington on April 11, 1908, while engaged in work under the convention, including clerical expenses that may be incurred in carrying out the convention during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, \$2,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the gentleman from Virginia whether this commissioner is the commissioner who agreed to a convention between this country and Canada that has not been approved?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I beg the gentleman's pardon, I could not hear him.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to know whether the commissioner provided for in this fisheries matter is the commissioner who agreed to a convention between the United States and Canada that has not been approved?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will ask unanimous consent to pass over the next paragraph temporarily.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the next paragraph be passed temporarily.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to pass the next paragraph temporarily. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES OF THE CONSULAR SERVICE.

For salaries of consuls general and consuls, as provided in the act approved January —, 1915, entitled "An act for the improvement of the foreign service," \$1,060,000: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated for salaries of consuls general and consuls contained in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915," approved June 30, 1914, is hereby made available for salaries of consuls general and consuls at the rate of compensation specified in the act entitled "An act for the improvement of the foreign service," approved January —, 1915; and that there is also hereby appropriated for salaries of consuls general and consuls, to be expended in accordance with the provisions of the said act of January —, 1915, the additional sum of \$13,333.35.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer several amendments to that. The first one is in line 15, page 19, to strike out the figures "\$1,060,000" and insert "\$1,069,000." It was a typographical error. The amount the committee intended to report was \$1,069,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Then, in line 13, strike out the word "January" and insert "February 5."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. And then, on the same page, line 24, strike out the word "January" and insert "February 5."

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. And on page 20, line 3, the same amendment, to strike out "January" and insert "February 5."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, just for the purpose of calling the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that this is also a deficiency appropriation, and, that he may not overlook it when he comes to draw the bill a year from now, I wish to say that it is in line with the first item of the bill that I called to his attention.

I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the pro forma amendment, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXPENSES OF CONSULAR INSPECTORS.

For the actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses of consular inspectors while traveling and inspecting under instructions from the Secretary of State, \$15,000: *Provided*, That no inspector shall be allowed expenses for subsistence in excess of \$10 per day.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. This proviso authorizes \$10 a day for subsistence, I think that is too much. When we passed the consular reorganization bill, I think in that bill, as far as they were concerned, we changed it to \$5 a day.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Five dollars a day.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman willing to do that here?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I am.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "\$10" and insert "\$5."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, line 12, strike out "\$10" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Allowance for clerk hire at consulates, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, \$493,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I notice that here is an increase in these Democratic times of \$117,800 in clerk hire alone. The committee states it is occasioned by substituting American clerks for clerks of the domicile where these consular offices are established, and also by reason of increased work. Can the gentleman inform the committee how much is due directly to increase of salaries occasioned by the employment of American clerks and how much by reason of increased service?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The proposition is to increase the clerical force at the consulate and to eliminate from it, as far as possible to do, everybody except Americans. They have now in some of these consulates people working for \$400 to \$600 a year who are natives of the country in which the consulates are located, and it has been the purpose of the department for quite a number of years to eliminate the foreign employees and fill our consulates with Americans. That has been done to some extent already, and appropriations have been increased for that purpose. I can not say exactly how much we will use for that purpose, but enough will be used to carry that into effect and the balance of it for the giving of more clerical force to these consulates which the department does not think have a sufficient clerical force. In many instances the consuls have to do the clerical work and can not get around sufficiently to gather information valuable to the department and to our mercantile people.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the report of the department that is included on page 11 of the report I find that the amount now appropriated would provide one clerk at \$1,259 for each office. Does that refer to the amount appropriated for the present fiscal year?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is an allowance of \$1,259 for a clerk for each consular office. Now, you propose to increase this appropriation nearly one-third, nearly 33½ per cent, in these pressing times of economy?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. We did not think this was an item upon which to economize. When the opportunity for enlarging the commercial influence of this country all over the world is so great, we did not think it was time to economize in our consular work.

Mr. STAFFORD. The question of enlarged activities is not involved at all. They have clerks, but they happen to be natives of the country in which they are located. Now you propose to send American clerks to those places and you will be obliged to send them at increased salaries. We have an item just preceding for 40 consular assistants at \$40,000, an average of a little over \$1,000, and yet you are proposing here, without any information as to the increased salaries to be paid to these men in these pressing times, over \$117,000 additional to be paid at the will of the Secretary of State and in a haphazard way.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It is not haphazard and it is not at the will of the Secretary of State. It is in pursuance of a well-regulated system conducted by gentlemen who are familiar with the situation and necessities confronting our Consular Service.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman says that will improve the system, and yet he has no facts to present to the committee when I asked him what the facts are.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I have stated the facts.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. I asked him at the very start, and he stated that he could not furnish the information, as to how much of the increase would be occasioned by the substitution of American clerks for these foreigners, and how much for increased work. The gentleman stated he could not furnish the information.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Well, I can not furnish that, and that is a matter of very minor importance; very minor importance indeed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, very minor importance to the Democratic chairman of the committee that is appropriating \$117,000

more than the total appropriation for this item in the bill of last year.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. If the gentleman wants to clog the commercial prosperity of this country and our efforts to extend our trade in foreign lands, let him vote against the appropriation.

Mr. STAFFORD. There has never been any opposition by Republicans at any time to the improvement of the service; in fact, the reorganization of the service as to these clerks was adopted by a Republican administration about 10 years ago; but this is only a means of creating places and taking care of some favorites.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Oh, that is too despicable an argument to call for an answer.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman can not answer it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a word?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Virginia knows that the gentlemen on this side of the House are asking the courtesy of that side of the House, which the gentleman, I know, is very willing to grant.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood] moves that the committee do now rise. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LINTHICUM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 21201) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and had come to no resolution thereon.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. POWERS, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of John Storms, H. R. 1480, first session Sixty-third Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. ALEXANDER, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Catherine J. Thomas, H. R. 16768, Sixtieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of George Tederbaum, no adverse report having been made thereon.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, executive clerk, announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On January 28, 1915:

H. R. 19076. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911;

On February 15, 1915:

H. R. 19424. An act to extend the time for the completion of the municipal bridge at St. Louis, Mo.;

H. R. 20818. An act to authorize the Brunot Island Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the back channel of the Ohio River; and

H. R. 20933. An act extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn., authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Arkansas & Memphis Railway Bridge & Terminal Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn.," approved August 23, 1912.

On February 17, 1915:

H. R. 9584. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to sell the present old post office and the site thereof in the city of Jersey City, N. J.; and

H. R. 18783. An act to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building and site at St. Petersburg, Fla.;

On February 18, 1915:

H. R. 16896. An act for the relief of Col. Richard H. Wilson, United States Army.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 17765. An act to regulate details of majors in the Ordnance Department;

H. R. 17907. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Interstate Bridge & Terminal Co., of Muscatine, Iowa, to build a bridge across the Mississippi River;

H. R. 17122. An act for the relief of John Burrows; and

H. J. Res. 391. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to postpone the sale of fur-seal skins now in the possession of the Government until such time as in his discretion he may deem such sale advisable.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 19376. An act confirming patents heretofore issued to certain Indians in the State of Washington; and

H. R. 19545. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. HELVERING was granted leave of absence for two days, on account of illness.

PURCHASE OF SHIPS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the conferees on the part of the House on the bill (S. 5259) to establish one or more United States Navy mail lines between the United States and South America and between the United States and the countries of Europe: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PADGETT, Mr. HARDY, Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland, Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts, Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts, and Mr. HINDS.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order made, until to-morrow, Saturday, February 20, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. Letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of the First Presbyterian Church of Darien, Ga., v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1614); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

2. Letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting schedule of papers and documents which are not needed in the transaction of public business in the Post Office Department and which have no permanent value or historical interest (H. Doc. No. 1615); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

3. Letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting report of Winifred H. Osgood, Edward A. Preble, and George H. Parker, scientific assistants of the Bureau of Fisheries, on the fur seals and other life on the Pribilof Islands in 1914; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from the committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21441) to amend section 260 of the Judicial Code, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1419), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of Utah, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21139) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to patent certain lands to the State of Utah and to accept from said State certain other lands in lieu thereof, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1420), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 409) authorizing the President to extend invitations to the Governments of Central and South America to appoint representatives to attend a conference with the Secretary of the Treasury in the city of Washington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1421), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLARK of Florida, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20738) to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1913, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1422), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 413) to authorize the appointment of an advisory committee for aeronautics, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1423), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21359) granting the consent of Congress to the Citizens' Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Burlington, Iowa, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1424), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 21508) for organizing and creating an efficient reserve and defensive force of citizen soldiery for national defense from among the members of organized societies and fraternities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STOUT: A bill (H. R. 21509) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to appoint a commission to negotiate with the Crow Indians for the cession of their lands lying west of the Big Horn River on the Crow Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 21510) to amend the Criminal Code of the United States by inserting therein a new section to be known as section 10417a; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 427) providing for the continuance of the Joint Commission to Investigate Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 428) for the appointment of a commission to investigate and report measures for the development of the American merchant marine and commerce; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 429) reappropriating and making available unexpended balances of appropriations for Indian reclamation projects in Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, urging the enactment of legislation compelling the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. to construct a good, safe, permanent bridge across the Missouri River at Chamberlain in said State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Memorial of the Legislature of South Dakota, urging the enactment of legislation compelling the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. to construct a good, safe, permanent bridge across the Missouri River at Chamberlain in said State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DILLON: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, urging Congress to compel the Chicago, Mil-

waukee & St. Paul Railway Co. to construct a permanent railway bridge across the Missouri River at the city of Chamberlain; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STOUT: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the opening of the Crow Indian Reservation to settlement; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the enactment of a law giving title to all desert-land entrymen to claims filed prior to March 23, 1914; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the reestablishment of postal service to Cook City, Mont.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the payment of one-half the expense of building a bridge across the Big Horn River, in Big Horn County, out of Crow Indian moneys; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 21511) granting an increase of pension to John R. Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21512) granting an increase of pension to Thomas T. Reasor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERGUSON: A bill (H. R. 21513) for the relief of Frances L. Llewellyn; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 21514) for the relief of the heirs of Lidda Goff, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REED: A bill (H. R. 21515) granting a pension to Dennis Ryng; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 21516) granting an increase of pension to Joseph N. Elmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 21517) for the relief of Benjamin F. Willis; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Petworth (D. C.) Citizens' Association, favoring prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition of Emil Meyer and other citizens of Brown County, Kans., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of citizens of Kingston, N. Y., and citizens of St. Louis, Mo., and vicinity, favoring an embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Union Biscuit Co., of St. Louis, Mo., favoring an embargo on wheat; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of Linden Baptist Bible School and Church, Camden, N. J., against any abridgment of the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of citizens of New York City, favoring exclusion of the Menace from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of New York City, against any abridgment of the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petition of sundry citizens of Auburn, N. Y., favoring passage of the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of citizens of Seneca County, N. Y.; Emil A. Linder, jr., and 76 others; George King and 26 others; O. D. Kane and 27 others; St. Andrew's Branch, No. 285, C. M. B. A., all of Rochester, and J. D. Waterbury and 12 others, of Lyndonville, N. Y., protesting against House bill 20644, press-muzzle bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of citizens of New Jersey, favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petitions of sundry citizens and societies of New Jersey, favoring bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of citizens of the seventh district of Ohio, favoring the passage of the Hamill bill, H. R. 5139; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Petition of St. Joseph Untereest Verein, of Little Rock, Ark., favoring curtailment of license usurped by Menace and other publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KAHN: Petitions of 75 citizens of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the use of the United States mails by the Menace; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of 120 citizens of San Francisco, Cal., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of residents of Burbank, Sawtelle, Los Angeles, Redlands, Santa Ana, Long Beach, Downey, Riverside, Escondido, Lakeside, San Bernardino, Glendale, Santa Barbara, Norwalk, and San Diego, all of the State of California, protesting against the enactment of the bills H. R. 20644, H. R. 20780, and H. R. 21183, to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petitions of citizens of the fifteenth Pennsylvania district, favoring bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINDQUIST: Petition of Rev. R. A. Baker and others, of Enniscorthy, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the proposed Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Charles Guiff and others, of Mount Pleasant, Mich., protesting against the proposed Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of George Matteson and others, of San Lake, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the proposed Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of J. P. Wierman and others, of Breckenridge, Mich., protesting against the proposed Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Charles Catzbeck and sundry citizens and members of the German School Society of New Britain, Conn., favoring bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of 75 citizens of Otoe County, Nebr., favoring bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE: Petition of Wurttemberger Untere Verein, of Philadelphia, Pa., urging legislation to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petition of citizens of McKees Rocks, Pa., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NEELEY of Kansas: Petition of sundry citizens of seventh congressional district of Kansas, protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Kansas, protesting against and abridgment of the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NEELY of West Virginia: Petition of citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., favoring bills prohibiting export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Memorial of Ponevlezei Progressive Association, of Chelsea, Mass., favoring system of Federal, State, and municipal free employment; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of post office clerks of Chicago, Ill., against proposed Senate committee amendment on page 14, lines 10 to 20, of the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: Petition of citizens of Greeley and Brush, Colo., and other citizens of Colorado, against any abridgment of the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Federal Club, Trinidad, Colo., favoring Hamill civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: Petition of citizens of Sagerton, Tex., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, February 20, 1915.

(Legislative day of Friday, February 19, 1915.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19909) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fall	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Fletcher	Overman	Smoot
Brady	Gallinger	Page	Stone
Brandegee	Gronna	Perkins	Thomas
Bryan	James	Poinceter	Thompson
Burleigh	Jones	Ransdell	Tillman
Burton	Kenyon	Robinson	Townsend
Catron	Kern	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Chamberlain	La Follette	Shafroth	Walsh
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Sheppard	Warren
Colt	Lodge	Sherman	White
Culberson	Martin, Va.	Shively	Works
Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I was requested by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] to state that he is detained from attendance at this time on the Senate by work upon the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] has been called home on account of the death of a dear friend, and will be absent for several days.

Mr. RANSDELL. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] on account of sickness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SUTHERLAND] on account of illness. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The pending question is on the amendment of the committee on page 124.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I desire to be heard very briefly on the pending amendment. I represent an agricultural State, and I make bold to say, notwithstanding the very great number of agricultural associations, granges, and other similar bodies in that State, I have not received one request from anyone in Ohio representing the agricultural interest asking for the adoption of this amendment, which is a proof to my mind that the farmers of the country do not desire it.

At this time, when the revenue is less than the expenditure, it seems to me we should hesitate a very long time before adopting any such amendment saddling upon the country so large an expense. I think the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] yesterday suggested a better way for securing these statistics. The method in vogue in North Dakota to which he referred, a report by the assessors, has been adopted in many of the States, and it is possible in that manner to obtain reliable figures.

I recognize that many of the reports have been altogether inaccurate. For instance, for a long time, up until after 1910 the statistics in regard to the number of cattle in the country were erroneous. The accepted figures showed no decrease at any time. But the reports made soon after 1910 showed not only a decrease in proportion to population, but showed an absolute decrease between 1890 and 1900 in number, and only a slight increase between 1900 and 1910. I question, however, whether this method will give us any more valuable statistics than can be obtained in other ways. In addition to that, the decisive argument to my mind is the very large and unnecessary expense contemplated by the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. KENYON. The yeas and nays, I suggest, have been ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER]. He is absent, and I withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], who is absent, and for the present I will withhold my vote.

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). I have a pair for the day with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to inquire whether the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] has voted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have a general pair with that Senator, and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. WALSH (after having voted in the negative). I observe that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] has not voted. I have a general pair with that Senator. I transfer my